

# **anvil**

*a student anti-war quarterly*

***Youth Has the Floor***

***A Student Debate:***

***World Federalism Versus Socialism***

***Education in Russia***

***Labor in Cold War***

***Trends In Modern Dance***

***Sexual Initiation of Women***

***A Conflict in Earnest***

***Editorials • Reviews • Poetry***

Published By

**The New York Student  
Federation Against War**



**Winter Quarter**

**1950**

# anvil

*A Student Anti-War Quarterly*

Volume II, No. 1



Winter Quarter, 1950

## IN THESE PAGES

<b>Editorial: Youth Has the Floor</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<i>James Fenwick</i>	
<b>The Federation Takes the Floor</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Education Behind the Iron Curtain</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<i>Gertrude Black</i>	
<b>A Conflict in Earnest</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>Isaac Rosenfeld</i>	
<b>Cold War in the Labor Movement</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>Justin Grossman</i>	
<b>Six Poems</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<i>Ralph Marcus, Ben-Ami Scharfstien, Stanley Fischer, Howard Griffin, Simon Perchik, Amy Geliebter</i>	
<b>Debate: World Federalism Versus Socialism</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<i>Myron Weiner and W. Walters</i>	
<b>The Sexual Initiation of Women</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<i>Simone de Beauvoir</i>	
<b>Trends in the Modern Dance</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<i>Harvey Lichtenstein</i>	
<b>Film Reviews</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<i>Helen Neville and Avel Austin</i>	
<b>Book Reviews</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<i>Ralph Marcus and Bernard Cornfeld</i>	

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Julius Jacobson, <i>Editor</i>	W. Walters, <i>Business Manager</i>
Laura Citron	Sam Bottone
Ralph Marcus	Abe Victor
	Bernard Cornfeld
	Norman Eiger

published by the

NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR  
247 Lexington Avenue New York, N. Y.

## anvil notes

We hope that all our readers feel as buoyant about ANVIL's rapid progress as we do. It is, after all, they who made the printing of ANVIL possible—by buying close to 2,000 copies of the first issue.

We might as well confess now that when ANVIL began, no one dreamed of a 35,000 word, 32 page, printed ANVIL. We were hopeful enough of selling a few hundred copies of each issue and slowly expanding during the next year. But three editions later, with campuses clamoring for more copies, we decided to throw all caution to the wind. We were sure that our many friends would support us in this—financially daring—effort.

In spite of the tremendous increase in cost occasioned by the printing of ANVIL we have decided to keep the original price of 15 cents per copy. ANVIL is a non-profit magazine; it is entirely supported by student subscriptions. The sale of as many copies of the publication as possible is our only source of income. We have not raised the price because we were sure that we could sell the 3,000 copies of this issue necessary to "break even." You can help us make this experiment a success—by talking about us, by showing ANVIL to your friends, sending it to friends in other colleges, patronizing our advertisers, and by sending in your year's subscription.

*A note to our advertisers:* In line with our announced policy of retaining the original price of ANVIL, we are also keeping our original advertising rates, although they were designed for the first mimeographed ANVIL. With our circulation growing and a reader's circle of primarily a student nature, we believe we can perform a valuable function for our present and prospective advertisers. Elsewhere on this page you will find our advertising rates listed. They are, we believe, the lowest in the field.

W. WALTERS, *Business Mgr.*

## anvil benefit Spring Forum Series

Dwight Macdonald • Irving Howe  
Meyer Schapiro • Paul Goodman  
and others

Exact dates and places will be published in special announcements by affiliated clubs.

### ANVIL ADVERTISING RATES

#### Wide Columns

\$2.00 per col. inch	\$15.00 per 1/2 page
4.25 per 1/3 page	22.50 per 1/4 page
8.00 per 1/4 page	30.00 full page

(Copy must be received 10 days  
before publication date)

## Youth Has The Floor

### *An Editorial Analysis of Current International Conflicts and Tensions*

**THE AVERAGE AGE** of the readers of ANVIL must be somewhere around twenty. The first half of the life of this generation, therefore, coincided with the ten-year span of the Great Depression. It is impossible to say what traumatic effect the depression may have had upon the unconscious of this age group. If the effects were significant they will show up under future stress. On the conscious level, however, the depression could not have had much effect: the worst of it was over by the time the members of this generation were four or five years old.

The second—and most conscious—decade of this generation's life was passed under conditions of war or the threat of war. But it was a war experience spent outside of the armed forces and outside the theater of war itself. It was a war experience with all the heightened emotional tension which war evokes, but with very little of its grim realities. It is notable that there is as yet not even a significant revolt against it on the part of young people. The fact of war has come to be accepted as a permanent part of existence by great numbers of them. That is a measure of the distance we have come since the 1920s, when Remarque published his *All Quiet on the Western Front*, that tortured cry of another generation. To many reading the book today it must seem a rather naive work. Indignation at the simple horror of war? We have seen Hiroshima.

If this is true of the generation as a whole, what is the state of affairs of the young intellectuals, those men and women who have achieved some sort of idea of the historical continuum and who, in one fashion or another, envisage existence as a social and not an individual act? In short, what is the condition of the actual and potential readers of ANVIL?

The interest in culture as well as in politics is obvious; the pages of ANVIL are witness of it. It is a sensitive appreciation. If the gods are old ones they are at least well understood ones. This interest is normal, for an interest in the world of artistic representation is an early and necessary stage in the expanding ego, understood in a totally non-perjorative sense. What is absent is a complementarily developed curiosity concerning the realm of the art of history and the art of current politics. There is a corollary absence of significant action in the progressive political field.

This is a condition which is in the process of changing. The appearance of ANVIL, and its surprisingly warm reception, are a welcome indication that a core of young persons is developing, dedicated to a change in the present destructive course of world politics. They have scant reverence for the current leaders of public life, who have demonstrated nothing but their own incapacity, and who hardly ever speak of averting war even in their most lyrical flights.

War is the central question of the day, and central to the war is the United States. That is why a most serious responsibility rests upon the young people of this country. It is they who in great part, if perhaps not exclusively, will decide whether history will view our epoch as the one in which mankind collapsed under the weight of blind social forces or as the one in which the descent into atomic barbarism was checked. There is no god that will save us. Things will not simply work out. To believe so is to renounce the conclusions to which the least acute mind is forced by a logical projection of present events. We will save ourselves or we will not be saved at all. It is to the youth we must primarily address ourselves, unabashed by the cynicism of the present world leadership, which daily proves itself incapable of tapping the glowing idealism of youth for any useful purpose whatsoever.

Two colossi are girding themselves for war. Their shadows fall across the lives of almost everyone throughout the globe. Of Russia we do not need to say very much. Newspapers, books, and magazine articles are making a profitable career exposing the infamies of that totalitarian regime. The tragedy of our time is that most of it is not false propaganda. It is the simple truth.

Of the United States something more has to be said. We move in a manufactured propaganda mist, where even the broadest outlines of things can escape us. The truth becomes elusive, hard to establish. Further, the United States is the locus of our activity. We are thereby obligated to extend the minutest attention to all events on the current scene.

#### **Military Trends in American Life**

The economic facts are impressive enough. Writing in the *New York Times* for December 8, 1949, James Reston says:

Ten years ago this week, though the war in Europe had started, the United States was spending \$8 for national defense for every man, woman and child in the country. Today the figure is \$85 per year per head. On international affairs ten years ago the Government spent 15 cents per year per head; today it is spending \$42.

Four dollars a year was the cost per person for veterans' affairs in 1939; in the present fiscal year it is \$44. To service the national debt ten years ago the cost per person was \$7: now it is \$38. And for all other Government costs in 1939 each person paid \$49, while today the cost is \$80 per person.

At the present time 72 cents of every taxable dollar goes to pay for the cost of past wars and of defense against any future war.

It is something more than a simple witticism to say that Clausewitz's famous dictum has been inverted to read: "Politics is war carried on by other means." Hardly anything can be projected by Congress without considering its effect upon the war preparations. Virtually nothing is exempt from this influence, even the once-cloistered campus. For the 1949-1950 academic year over \$100,000,000 will be given to universities

by the federal government. Most of this is for research directly related to war. Mars, not the Muses, will be the recipient.

Benjamin Fine, writing in the *New York Times* for December 12, 1949, says:

Typical of the university research program is that at Boston University. During 1949-50 it will receive \$500,000 from the Government and from industry to support fundamental research in a variety of fields—ten times as much as it received in 1941-42. The major portion of the grants and contracts by the government are sponsored by the Air Force, the Air Materiel Command, the Office of Naval Research and the Public Health Service.

The trend is toward the military state. More and more, military necessity governs. More and more, the "invisible hand" which Adam Smith saw governing the play of the market becomes exposed—and it is a mailed one.

What is happening?

The United States indisputably emerged from World War II with the most powerful economic organism on the globe. Every other debilitated capitalist power in the allied camp was nursed back to relative health by Marshall Plan aid. Even so, their health has proved to be shaky. England is slowly dying with the infirmities of political-economic old age: outmoded machinery, the absence or near exhaustion of necessary, cheap raw materials, a small internal market, the loss of colonies, two world wars, a dollar shortage. France—deceptively sustained through the crisis of the 'twenties and 'thirties by the luxury trades, her victory over Germany in World War I—is now, following World War II, clearly revealed as the third-rate power she has been in actuality since 1914. Italy is even worse off. It is one of the few western capitalist countries currently confronted with a serious unemployment problem. Germany and Japan are defeated powers and, amid their grandiosely wrecked economies, are expiating their sin of losing the war. In short, nowhere on the world market is the United States seriously challenged.

#### **U. S. Is Dominant Non-Stalinist Nation**

Political hegemony accompanies this economic strength. That two important nations, Germany and Japan, have any sort of political life at all is only through the sufferance of the United States. In the cabinet meetings of the recently allied capitalist nations the presence of the United States is unseen but palpable. When even proud England decided to devalue the pound sterling, an institution practically as immutable as the Ten Commandments or the Saturday night bath, it was done openly, in consultation with the United States. Russia gives witness to the role of the United States by singling her out as the main antagonist and ideologist of the capitalist camp in the cold war. Only eight years ago there was a vocal isolationist movement in this country. Who would seriously think of trying to revive it today?

The economic, political, and military problems posed for solution by United States imperialism are dizzying in their scope and complexity. On the economic level the United States currently finds itself with the western economy relatively stabilized, due in part to the Marshall Plan—and new problems undermining the just-achieved stability. Having restored production at least to pre-war norms, and in most cases having exceeded them, the Marshall Plan countries find themselves in a competitive and protected international market, with no country disposed to lower tariff barriers—thereby ruining native industry. The United States, the greatest dis-

turbing element on the international market, proposes some sort of unified continental economy but gives no sign of making any concessions toward achieving that end. A revival of Western German and Japanese industry is necessary if these countries are not to fall under the influence of Stalinism. But what will be the effect of this upon a market which is already exhibiting signs of glut? Italy? Greece? Spain? Other pauperized countries? Given these presently insoluble contradictions, pressure for recourse to the limitless consumers' market—war goods—will inevitably mount.

The political problems are hardly less thorny. The essence of the matter is the mobilization of world manpower for the intended war against Russia. The people of the world are aware of what is contemplated for them. The bigger powers do not want to become the tools of an insatiable imperialism like the United States. Colonies do not want to retain a colonial status guaranteed by United States backing. They are not keen on being ground to pieces between the two imperialist millstones in the projected war. Western Germany, Japan, and Spain, for numerous and obvious reasons, have to be integrated into the allied bloc. How is this to be done with minimum repercussions abroad and at home? There is the matter of Yugoslavia. What is to be done about Stalinist China? What can be done? Who dares picture conditions following a victory of the Allies in World War III? None of the leading political figures. For, like Hitler in his day, they have no over-all political strategy. They are jumping off into the dark.

#### **Effects of Political and Economic Problems on Military**

All these problems take on an extreme expression within the military establishment, whose job is actually to conduct the war, not engage in irresponsible journalistic speculation about it. The United States needs European military manpower; domestic resources are absolutely inadequate for fighting a war against a country the size of Russia. But is such manpower available? Can it be trained in time, and with modern equipment? How reliable will it be?

The manpower shortage will have to be compensated for by highly mechanizing the army and equipping it with superior weapons. Can the economy stand it? Can it stand it with the present form of government? What can Europe contribute? How can the interim period up to actual war best be bridged militarily? The atom bomb is no magic solution, more than one official source is now indicating. Against a dispersed industry or troops deployed in the field its utility is limited. The United States is comparably much more vulnerable to it than is Russia.

It is such problems which are giving pause to the military. A sober realization of what a war against Russia involves is unquestionably one of the reasons for toning down of the war talk.

Military leaders by and large have not been traditionally considered exactly brilliant people outside of their own bloody craft, and the military craft itself is normally considered of no high order. The leading personnel of the United States military establishment were trained in the pre-1939 period, which means that their outlook was conservative by military standards and narrowly military in terms of the total nature of modern war. It was characteristic of the level of their understanding that whenever they made the slightest step into other fields they were reluctantly forced to call in

civilian experts, a large number of whom were German and Austrian emigré professors. The military-political lessons of World War II are only now being absorbed. Steps are being taken to broaden the curriculum at West Point, for example. But the cultural lag is very great. The Russians are politically sophisticated. Further, the United States military establishment is riddled with service bigotry. It is doubtful if such a condition presents much of a problem for Stalinist totalitarianism.

The military cannot expect too much help from the State Department, even when they do not oppose its encroachments. It, too, is inexperienced. Nor does it have mass political parties in other countries to manipulate, as does Russia. Fundamentally, of course, it is trying to hold together a disintegrating system which has long since demonstrated that the epoch of national states has reached the end of its usefulness. Better men than the Ivy Leaguers in the State Department could do no better, given such bases for operation.

### The B-36 Fixation and Military Factionalism

Under these conditions it is not surprising that a great deal of friction should be generated as the United States military leadership attempts to adjust itself to the new tasks which history is presenting it. If the recent dispute centering around the B-36 seemed to be on a primitive level, it was not accidental. Nevertheless, any student of the times can profitably examine this tortuously developed and superficially confusing dispute which so fully occupied the sophisticated metropolitan press during recent months. It is a certainty that the Russian General Staff followed the polemics minutely. Valuable clues as to the probable development of United States policy and, thereby, world policy, are contained in them.

What is the reality behind all the talk about discrimination, free speech, a B-36 fixation, etc.? The facts are simple, though they managed to get pretty well obscured in the Congressional hearings.

The first fact is that the balance of forces in a war with Russia will be different from what it was in World War II. The Navy will be relatively smaller, less important, and of a different nature. These differences may even attain an absolute character. Russia is basically a land power, as was Germany. Therefore the major war effort will be expended on the ground and air forces. Russia has no battleships; in any event, the day of the battleship is over. It has been supplanted by the aircraft carrier. The Navy's role is destined to be confined largely to convoying, anti-submarine patrolling, assault landings, and, in the event large areas on the continent are denied to United States forces, perhaps some strategic bombing. This reduction of status was opposed, rather blindly, by the Navy. Their attack consisted of a demand for a larger share in strategic bombing and a simultaneous condemnation of its efficacy.

In making its case the Navy trampled around on the tender beginnings of unification which had been made. On other occasions the lapse of protocol might have been overlooked. But the stakes are too high now, the margin of superiority over Russia too small to yield to the tantrums of prima donnas. In prosecuting World War III the industrial potential of the United States will have to be carefully allocated. Mistakes made in World War II, when, for example, at one point

strategic bomber construction (later discovered to have been of dubious utility) absorbed half of the English industrial capacity at a time when landing craft were needed, cannot be repeated. Similarly today, the Navy cannot be allowed to expand its component at the expense of the over-all strategy as so far conceived. Hence the firmness in dealing with the Navy.

There are other unresolved problems. One of them is the numerical relation to be established between the strategic and tactical air forces, on which question there is a strong tendency for the Army and Air Corps to take opposite positions. This conflict may well break out into the open and have to be adjudicated. But no struggle of this nature will have any relation to the peaceful evolution of mankind. Involved will be only questions of prosecuting the war and of bureaucratic prestige. Whatever faction of this popularly uncontrolled military hierarchy wins out, one thing is certain: the militarization of our society will continue. The current indications are numerous and have been detailed in ANVIL.<sup>1</sup>

### An Historical Analogy to Present Trends

We don't have to speculate on where this will all end. History affords us an illuminating example. There was once a perfect military state and its name was Sparta. It exploited a half-million Massenians for the exclusive benefit of 25,000 Spartans and their dependents. But to do this the entire adult male population of Sparta had to be enrolled in the armed forces, in which they were obligated to serve in one fashion or another from the age of seven until sixty. They ate and slept in barracks. Foreign trade and travel were discouraged. Visitors from other countries were put under surveillance. Periodically the mentally and physically outstanding helots were slain. Their culture in any humanistic sense became utterly sterile. "If a state," says Harry Elmer Barnes in his *History of Western Civilization*, "is to be valued in terms of efficiency, stability of government, and the creation of an invincible military machine, then Sparta was both a good and a successful state. It was on these grounds that Sparta was admired by the Hellenic world. It is significant, however, that Xenophon observed that while the other Greek states admired the Spartan system, none of them was anxious to adopt it. . . ." In the end the conquerors had enslaved not only the Massenians but themselves as well. It is not without reason that history links the names of Sparta and Athens only as polar contrasts.

Russia is close to such a Spartan state. We have set out on the rocky road that leads to it.

Oswald Schwartz is probably right when he says that only in periods of decay does man ask himself, "What should I do to make life worth living?" The decay has reached such an advanced stage, however, that we can pose another question to ourselves: "What should I do to make life possible at all?"

The youth have the floor.

James M. FENWICK

James M. Fenwick is a graduate student at the New School for Social Research.

1. See article on *Growing Militarization of America* by Roy Repler in Fall, 1949, issue of *Anvil*.

# The Federation Takes The Floor

## *Ideas and Action*

**THE QUESTION OFTEN POSED** by the anti-war student is: "What can I do that is positive?" or "What do you propose to do besides 'talk'?" These questions are asked with increasing frequency. They are understandable questions. But we cannot agree with their intent, that ideas are not acts. Ideas are acts. They are important acts. Without them there would be nothing. Organizations are not built *per se*; they are built around ideas and these ideas become guides for more specific forms of action. This is a truism which is too often neglected in the considerations of those who ask the questions.

The anti-war movement has been set back tremendously as compared to the militant student organizations of the '30s. Not only have the mass student organizations of that decade disappeared but the ideas around which they were built have but a faint echo today on campus. Many factors have conspired to dissipate the student militancy of the '30s. The misleadership and gyrations of the Stalinists in the late '30s and '40s dealt the student movement a foul blow. From Pearl Harbor to Hiroshima the government propaganda press, the draft and the war-mongering of the Stalinists completed the retreat of remaining anti-war sentiment on campus. Following the end of hostilities student political organizations began to emerge. But their numbers are, thus far, small and, with few exceptions, their programs pale and insipid.

This near-vacuum in student intellectual and political life must be filled. The student body must be eased out of its insulation against militant ideas and organizations. However, before we can build these organizations to significant proportions the ideas of that section of the student body which is opposed to both war camps must be widely diffused.

When we are asked therefore what can be done besides "talk," we first of all reply: "Do not minimize the importance of 'talk.'" Further we say: "More than talk is necessary, but do not use this obvious fact as a rationalization for not talking at all." If you are opposed to the war preparations of Russian and American imperialism, then discuss your ideas in the classroom, in your clubs, with your friends. Talking is meaningful action, too.

And there are things more concrete you can do. On most of the major campuses of New York there are chapters of the New York Student Federation Against War. These chapters need more than your sympathy. They need your active participation.

ANVIL is also something concrete. Not a literary exercise, it is designed to stimulate students to think and talk about political and cultural problems. It is a sphere of concrete activity for students: ANVIL has to be sold, its ideas need circulation and it depends on students for articles.

There are plenty of positive things to do: ideas must be talked about, anti-war clubs exist which need strengthening, and there is a need for new clubs. Within these clubs there are any number of more concrete things to be done: action must and can be taken to defend academic and civil freedom, protest rallies should be held against the growing militarization of American life; there are those to be educated and, yes,

propagandized about the need to fight for freedom and against war.

We cannot afford to hide behind the cover of "talk is useless."

## *Anvil's Future*

**WE DO NOT ENVISAGE ANVIL** as an exclusive vehicle for spreading the views of the New York Student Federation Against War. To be sure that is to be one of its more important functions; but in addition to this, we regard the magazine as an intellectual rallying center for students who want to express their views. ANVIL is not designed to become a purely political magazine. We welcome poems, essays, short stories and criticism which may be related or unrelated to political ideas. The editors intend to keep a proper balance between the weight of the political and non-political. ANVIL is a political and cultural magazine, not solely one or the other.

To broaden the magazine we are requesting our readers to submit articles for publication. Membership in the Federation or one of its affiliated clubs is by no means a necessary requirement for publication. If an article is submitted which opposes the views of the Federation it will be regarded as a discussion article and objectively considered. Creative writing will be judged solely on the basis of artistic merit.

In subsequent issues of ANVIL we hope to have as regular features several pages of letters from our readers and a column on events in the student movement. This project will be facilitated if individuals and clubs in and out of New York send us information about local club and campus events.

Rumor has it that since the publication of the initial issue of ANVIL several other student organizations are considering the publication of student magazines. We do not think it presumptuous to claim some responsibility for thus stimulating these other student organizations. ANVIL has proved that a student magazine can be a success. We welcome "competition" from other organizations. More important than any improbable loss of ANVIL sales will be the impetus given student intellectual activity by a variety of student publications.

## *Campus Clubs*

**THE NEW YORK STUDENT** Federation Against War is growing. Since the Federation was formally founded last summer the following campus organizations have either been already recognized by the school administration as an affiliate of the Federation or they are seeking that affiliation: Eugene V. Debs Society and the Socialist Club of Brooklyn College (day session); Politics Club of Brooklyn College (evening session); Socialist Club of New York University. Socialist Club of City College of New York (day session); Student Union to Resist War of City College of New York (evening session); Socialist Club of Columbia. The Socialist Club of the New School for Social Research is prohibited from joining by a school rule forbidding any recognized club from participating in an intercollegiate student organization. A ninth club at New York University is discussing the question of affiliation.

The Federation is going to continue to grow. We have the necessary ingredients for development: a militant program and a serious and determined membership.

# Education Behind The Iron Curtain

## *A Factual Analysis Of Russian Educational Techniques*

**INSTITUTIONS PROVIDE FOR** the historian a function supplementary to their indigenous interest. They can be studied as important barometers which reflect, perhaps only indirectly, but reflect nevertheless those social relations, attitudes and traditions which go to make up the social fabric. Education is perhaps the most sensitive in this respect. For the nature of the human being which a society wishes to create must of necessity be directly related to its existing social system and values. Education in a totalitarian state mirrors in an obvious fashion the standards of the society. The rigid discipline, dogma and emphasis on conformity of Catholic education point to its counterparts in the philosophy and structure of the church. The variegated pattern in American education, a pattern which includes the use of corporal punishment in the South and the existence of many advanced, progressive schools in other areas, indirectly reflects the shadings in American ideology and politics.

It is with this in mind, that we approach the development of Russian education since the revolution of October, 1917. In a planned society such as exists in Russia, where education is completely a state function, its study as a social barometer will be particularly applicable. Here, we can see directly the intentions of the rulers concerning its future generations of ruled. The history of education since 1917 in Russia presents two distinct phases. We will begin with the first covering the period from 1918 to 1929.

The profound changes initiated in Russia by the 1917 revolution permeated and revolutionized education. Almost everything except the physical rudiments of the old school system was swept away. Against the backdrop of an illiterate and backward country, the most advanced theories of education became the norm. It was a period of experimentation, of daring and of creative initiative.

### **Early Changes in Russian Education**

The men who took the leadership were advocates of progressive education. The lecture and discipline method was abandoned in favor of "learning through experience." The classroom unit was replaced by the study circle and laboratory. Subject material was not artificially administered to the child but was directly related to his own experience and thus coordinated with existing environment. The student became an investigator not a passive recipient. Discipline was self-discipline, a natural outgrowth of the human being developing through his own experience. The instructor directed the independent analysis of the student by formulating series of questions and theses.

Official Russian State Document No. 3 on school reform, drawn up June 2, 1918, states:<sup>1</sup>

The school must offer the widest possible opportunity for the full play and development of the creative forces of the child. . . . Essential pre-requisites hereof are:

- (a) Self activity of children in various fields of school life,

their independence and initiative while at work and a spirit of self-reliance in matters of everyday routine.

- (b) introduction of an educational system stimulating the creative forces of the child.
- (c) artistic activity as the chief element in the child's esthetic development, guiding the emotional processes of its spiritual life.
- (d) attention in the matter of child's education should chiefly aim to bring up a human being as a social creature and to produce an understanding of social labor. . . . Educational training is to be conducted in full conformity with the latest discoveries in psychology, physiology and pedagogy.

With the abandonment of the classroom unit and the lecture method go also the abandonment of discipline and regimentation. The maintenance of silence is no longer a prerogative for learning because the child now learns by doing, not only by listening. The quiet, passive and obedient student is not the "best child." Very often it is precisely this student who is the worst from a psychiatric viewpoint since fear and repression may be the basis for his inactivity.

No punishment of any kind was tolerated. The student was not encouraged to adopt an attitude of reverence toward his teacher. Real student self-government was initiated and encouraged.

No punishment whatever is being allowed. Children's self-government is being introduced in all schools.<sup>2</sup>

Examinations were abolished. This single decree is enough to indicate that a revolution had taken place in Russia. Education was made available to the masses of the people. Co-education was introduced. Experimental schools, always a good indication of freedom in a society, were encouraged. A call was sent out for educators to join with the government and participate in the educational drive. Teachers were given latitude in the preparation of syllabi and curriculums.

John Dewey writes in *Impressions of Soviet Russia*: "I have never seen anywhere in the world such a large proportion of intelligent, happy and intelligently occupied children" (published in 1929).

At a time when most schools in the world were run along the lines of conservative education, when school meant unhappiness, discipline and punishment for students, it was in a backward country ruled over for centuries by an autocracy, that the most modern and progressive ideas were state policy.

For the first time perhaps in history, patriotism disappeared from education. In the sense that children were brought up as members of the world community, socialist education in this brief period represented the application of the highest ideal of social development: the ideal of international brotherhood and solidarity. *The Declaration of Principles of a Socialist School* could say with justification, "Only the socialist school has the right to say that it does not turn a human being out a skilled laborer, but creates a man."

Pedagogy of this nature leaves no room for deification of leaders. Exaltation of leading figures has as its inevitable implication passive submission to their decisions. Emphasis

1. See *Education and Art in Soviet Russia* introduction by Max Eastman.

2. *Public Education in the USSR, 1926*—Introduction by Lunacharsky.

on independence and self-activity in education are not isolated pedagogical methods but directly relate to the training of the democratic human being. Reverence of the teacher is preparation for reverence of the leader. Enforced discipline, punishment and coercion are preparation for submission to the state which rules from above only by coercion. The democratic perspectives of the revolutionary Russian state of 1917 are reflected most clearly in their educational methods.

This does not mean that all worked perfectly, that a paradise of progressive education sprang up overnight. The devastation of the Civil War, loss of manpower and materials, lack of trained personnel and funds created tremendous barriers. It was with the utmost heroism that teachers and educators carried on their work sometimes under conditions of near starvation. They had almost for the first time freedom to experiment, to be creative. There were, as is inevitable in such a period, many extreme and untenable schemes offered—such as the abolition of all formal schools.—“The party, the street and the shop will teach them”—or the proposal to nationalize all children.

On the whole, however, education was carried on by serious and cultured men who understood the nature of their responsibilities and who understood educational theory. They were men who, believing in socialism, believed in the development of free, creative human beings, human beings who could develop out of happy, unregimented and active children.

#### Growth of Bureaucracy and Its Effect on Education

The closing of the period of progressive education in Russia coincided with social and economic changes which had been taking place since the twenties and began to achieve institutional status in the early thirties. The democracy of the first period gave way to open dictatorship. After a speech by Stalin denouncing “petty-bourgeois egalitarianism,” the early concept that “a government official should receive no more than the average skilled worker” was eliminated. A privileged bureaucracy of officials, managers and technicians developed with wide discrepancies in income between itself and the working class and peasantry. The brutal, forced collectivizations of the peasantry in 1929 marked the advent of a regime of terror and the disappearance of those remnants of democracy which had persisted through the twenties.

The period of experimentation in education came to a close in 1931 with the abandonment of the Dalton method and the re-institution of the classroom unit. Following this came the re-introduction of all the old values in education. Discipline, obedience and punishment replaced the standards of progressive education adopted in 1918. In 1932 student democracy disappeared and schools came again under the control of the director and his staff.

Organization of university or institute was taken out of the hands of the students and placed in the hands of the director and staff. Brigade laboratory work was abolished and individual work with individual responsibility introduced. Lecture by the professor was restored. Students were reprimanded for being late at lectures and persistent lateness or absence leads to expulsion from a higher education institute for 5 years.<sup>3</sup>

Following this came a series of measures which produced a complete break with the educational perspectives laid out in the early years of the revolutionary government. Elasticity in syllabi allowing for individual initiative of the instructor was replaced by a uniform syllabus fixed at the centre for compul-

sory adoption by the teacher. Experimental schools were abolished and today function merely as demonstration or model schools.<sup>4</sup> Examinations were reintroduced by decrees in 1932. Polytechnic education, a method which combines handiwork with the scientific principles underlying them, was abandoned in 1937. Thus, the class dualisms which were becoming realities in Russian economic and social life were reflected in education. The re-establishment of a separation in education between scientific principles and mechanical operations reflected the development in society of a gap between the privileged specialist and the manual laborer, with lessening opportunity for the latter to enter the strata of the former.

Discipline, obedience and punishment achieved great prominence as educational standards. The American sympathizers of the Russian regime who send their children to progressive schools would be the first to withdraw them from these schools if a pattern modelled on the Russian were to be adopted.

In the third place discipline is *firm*, that is, it is unquestioned obedience and submission to the leader, the teacher or the organizer. Without this there is no discipline; submission to the will of the leader is a necessary and essential mark of discipline.<sup>5</sup>

The teacher first of all makes exactions of the pupils during the recitation. He does not coax pupils, he demands obedience.<sup>6</sup>

Some Rules for School Children—adopted by the Soviet of People's Commissars, Aug. 2, 1943—to be fully formed in children as early as the first grade:

Rule No. 3—To obey without question the orders of the school directors or teacher.

Rule No. 9—To rise as the teacher or director enters or leaves the classrooms.

Rule No. 12—To be respectful to the school director and the teachers, to greet them on the street with a polite bow, boys removing their hats.

What the rules require is a reverent behavior toward the teacher—not just a courteous or correct one, but precisely a reverent behavior, an absolute submission to the orders of the teacher.<sup>7</sup>

And if the pupils do not conform to these demands . . . ?

Exemption from punishment demoralizes the pupil's will, it corrupts him, frees him of the unalterable necessity of concentration upon the tasks he has been set. Punishment provides obedience. . . .<sup>8</sup>

The pupil ought to know that no offences can be left unpunished and that serious misdemeanor will result in serious punishment, even expulsion from the school and handing over to a court.<sup>9</sup>

Children in Russia under the age of 16 are forbidden to visit movies on weekdays without the permission of the head of the school.

Internationalism and the elimination of patriotic teaching from the school system was one of the highest achievements of the revolutionary regime. Its replacement by the extreme nationalism of the Stalinist regime is example enough of the

4. See *Changing Man* by Beatrice King, 1937.

5. Taken from *Sovetskaya Pedagogika*—Oct. 1943. Reproduced in *I Want to be Like Stalin*, by George Counts.

6. *Ibid.* p. 101.

7. *Izvestia*, Sept. 4, 1944. A. Mostovoi, director of 330th School for Boys in Moscow.

8. *Pravda*, Jan. 16, 1944. Article by A. Protopopov.

9. *Sovetskaya Pedagogika*, No. 7, 1943.

3. See *Slavonic and East European Review*, July, 1938.

fundamental disparity between the present rulers and the early government of 1918. Its place in education?

The foundation of Soviet education was the objective of inculcating in a child a love of his country. . . . It is quite obvious that along with this is developed deep love and affection for the Communist Party and its leaders who are building a happy life for the country.<sup>10</sup>

The cultivation of the spirit of Soviet patriotism in the younger generation is the most important task of moral education in the country.<sup>11</sup>

The leader worship cult built around Stalin was amply demonstrated to the world on his recent 70th birthday, particularly, if we compare it to the modesty with which Lenin's birthday was celebrated by his compatriots. The man whose appearance according to the poem *Soviet Land* produces the effect of "a ray of summer sunshine," who has been compared by other eulogists to a sun god has "permitted" an adulation of himself that is unparalleled in history.

### Similarities in Nazi Education

The reversal in educational methods which took place in Russia after 1930 present a startling parallel to the "innovations" introduced by the Nazis in German education. Germany had been famous for its experimental schools. Hitler abolished them. Flexibility in curriculum was likewise eliminated. As under the Stalinist totalitarian state, discipline and obedience were demanded in the schools.

"The characteristics which the Nazi state requires and which the school must produce: Orderliness, obedience, comradeship, leadership."<sup>12</sup> For the word "behavior" hitherto used, "obedience" was substituted.

Patriotism and leader worship are too well known attributes of Nazism to bear much comment. Their attitude toward patriotic education is identical with that of Russian educators. "The cultivation of the spirit of Soviet patriotism in the younger generation" as "the most important task of moral education in the country"<sup>13</sup> expresses, if we replace the word "Soviet" with "German," precisely the aim of Nazi education. The teaching of religion in Nazi schools was replaced in actuality by a secularized religion of the state emphasizing the glories of Germany, its war heroes and its supreme hero, Hitler.

As we have learned from Mr. Pavlenko, "It is quite obvious that along with this [love of country] is developed a deep love and affection for the Communist Party and its leaders."<sup>14</sup>

The similarities between Nazi and Russian education are not accidental. They mirror the similarities between two totalitarian dictatorships. Discipline and obedience in school, patriotism, reverence for the teacher and the leader constitute excellent preparation for life under totalitarianism. We learn that one of the purposes of

. . . the cultivation of discipline in children is . . . the preparation for organized and disciplined labor in the higher schools, in production and in the service of the Red Army.<sup>15</sup>

### Tuition Fees and School Attendance

Perhaps the most significant development in Russian education was the introduction in 1940 of tuition fees in secondary and higher education. Primary education, which is available to the masses of people, is a necessity concomitant with the development of an industrial society. The complexities of industrial and urban life make literacy a social requirement. Proof of the fact that an industrial society affords its citizens educational opportunities can only be found when leaving the primary field, we find an accessibility of secondary and higher education to the masses.

From the early years of the regime efforts were made to maintain a large proletarian nucleus in the higher schools. After 1932, however, this emphasis dropped out of official pronouncements. By 1938 the proportion of salaried employees, specialists and their children at higher schools was 42.2 per cent.<sup>16</sup>

On October 2, 1940, a decree, Laws and Ordinances 1940-637,676, was passed fixing tuition fees for secondary schools and higher education as follows:<sup>17</sup>

- Secondary Classes—8th, 9th and 10th grades:
  - 200 rubles per annum for schools in capitals of republics
  - 150 rubles per annum for schools in all other towns and villages
- Higher Education:
  - 400 rubles per annum for colleges in capitals of republics
  - 300 rubles per annum for colleges in the provinces
  - 500 rubles per annum for theatrical, art and music colleges

The average monthly wage in Russia in 1938 was 287 rubles.<sup>18</sup> The realistic possibilities of a Russian worker sending his child through high school are obviously very slight.

Stipends are granted only to those students who maintain an average of 4.67 points (5 is the top mark) but who receive no "Fair" rating in any subject. There are no scholarships in secondary schools. Exemption from payment of fees on the secondary level is granted only to children of sick or disabled parents, to those who have lost their parents and to children of parents of *junior rank* in the armed forces. There is, thus, very little chance of a poor child receiving a scholarship since very few of them manage to complete secondary school. According to an article in the Moscow press, reported in the *Herald Tribune*, there were in 1949, 29 million children in Russian primary and secondary schools. Of these, 213,000 were scheduled to graduate. Estimating on the basis of ten grades, there should be an average of 2.9 millions in each class. The graduating class of 213,000 is therefore only seven per cent of the average class. *This means that more than 90 per cent of Russian children do not finish secondary school.*<sup>19</sup>

16. *Cultural Construction in the U.S.S.R.*, p. 114.

17. See *Secret of Soviet Strength* by Dean of Canterbury, Press Department Voks, 1940 and *Russia From A to Z* by Freund.

18. *Problems of Leninism* by Joseph Stalin, p. 642. Annual wage is given as 3447 rubles for average industrial worker.

19. The attempt to gauge the effect of the tuition fees on school attendance was very unsatisfactory given the contradictions in Stalinist figures. The population in Russian primary and secondary schools in 1937 is given as 38 million by Maisky, then Russian ambassador to England. In a speech made in 1938 reprinted as a pamphlet, *Soviet Youth: Its Training and Opportunity*. For the following year the Dean of Canterbury reports a figure of 31.5 million! (See "The Secret of Soviet Strength," p. 85-97.)

10. *New York Times*, Dec. 6, 1949. Interview with Pavlenko, director of Moscow Boys School 315.

11. *Sovetskaya Pedagogika*, 1943.

12. *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Nov. 18, 1936.

13. See above.

14. See above.

15. *Sovetskaya Pedagogika*, 1943. See above quoted book by Counts, p. 35.

According to Beatrice King, pro-Stalinist English writer, "For the majority the decision [for a career], never irrevocable, is taken at 14 years while for those who will pursue higher education the choice is made at 17 years."<sup>20</sup>

An attempted justification is given for the introduction of tuition fees:

The decision of the Council of Peoples Commissars was most conducive in consolidating the Soviet school and in improving the quality [sic] of secondary education.<sup>21</sup>

The needs of economy have been given as a basis for justifying fees as a necessary selective measure. But the selectivity, in practice, meant limiting higher education primarily to the rich and squeezing out sons and daughters of working class families. Genuine socialist policy in such a case of scarcity would have limited itself to deserving students. Today, for the most part, it is *social origin* which determines your education and consequently your career in Russia. Higher education is of major importance for the attainment of high position in modern life. Rich managers and salaried officials have thus hereditary perpetuation of their status since it is primarily their children who will be able to obtain the necessary training. Consequently, the educational decree of 1940 introduces a permanent class stratification into Russian society. High position, privilege and career are, for the most part, sealed off from children of the masses.

What happens to these children? According to the Labor Reserve Act of 1940 (the same year as the tuition decree) compulsory vocational education was introduced. One million boys aged 14-15 are recruited annually for a training course in one of the major industries. Responsibility for their board lies with the industry. After completing their training courses *they are directed to work three years in an industry run by one of the ministries.*<sup>22</sup> The law was later widened to include girls. Students in high schools and colleges are, of course, exempt from this law.

Any such measures as described above would be received with horror in the United States, particularly by Stalinists whose outcries would be in direct proportion to the warmth with which they defend its existence in the USSR.

A set-up similar to the Russian for charging fees at the secondary level existed in Nazi Germany. Here, too, a few scholarships were granted to excellent students. Higher education under Stalin and Hitler depend in the main on "which side of the state you live on."

### Co-Education Abandoned

The introduction of co-education in Russia after the 1917 revolution was a measure of extreme significance. Women in Russia had for centuries held a chattel status. The abandonment of co-education in 1943 for primary and secondary schools signalled a degeneration in the position of women in Russian society and a major reversal of education policy.

Co-education is today taken for granted by modern educators. Its abandonment always signifies a social regression. Separate schools existed in Nazi Germany. If we examine the reasons for its abolition in Russia we find again striking parallels to the aims of Nazi education.

The abandonment of co-education was one in a series of decrees since the '30s affecting women in Russia. Others were the illegalization of abortion, the establishment of stringent fees for divorce, putting it beyond the reach of working class families, and the institution of awards to women for bearing large numbers of children. The latter originated in Mussolini's Italy and was also copied by Hitler. The abolition of elementary rights for women signified that for the Russian state a prime role for women became what it has always been for reactionary regimes: a child-producing animal, supplying future soldiers for the motherland.

An admission and attempted justification by a Stalinist apologist:

They [departure from co-education, changes in attitude toward family, etc.]... have been widely interpreted abroad as evidence of reaction and restoration of class privilege in the U.S.S.R. They are more simply and accurately explained in terms of the desire of the party leadership to foster a larger measure of individual and family responsibility in education... to interest Soviet womanhood in homemaking and child rearing as well as in career and profession... But the motivation of the new policy of glorifying marriage and the family is quite simple; a chronic labor shortage, aggravated by colossal war casualties calls for more babies... Few thoughtful Western observers will regard the results as an instance of intolerable despotism or a return to Puritanism or prudery.<sup>23</sup>

The significance of the reversal on co-education can be gauged from the following quotations from the pro-Stalinist, Beatrice King:

Equality of the sexes is an axiom of the communist faith. In the educational field this expressed itself *first and foremost* in co-education which is the universal law.<sup>24</sup> [Emphasis my own—G. B.]

The same writer somersaults six years later:

Soviet educators and thinkers have come to the conclusion generally that at this stage separate education is necessary to produce the best citizens who will create the finest families.<sup>24</sup>

The claim by Russian educators that separate schools were established because girls are different from boys, that they mature faster, etc., can easily be discounted. This fact has been known for years and adjustments can be made easily within a flexible school system. Its significance is slight when we consider the advantages of combined schooling. The increased emphasis on the importance of the family as given above and the consequent necessity for motherhood training is a real and important reason. Also...

What are the demands of life which raise this question [separate schooling]. One is the improvement of the military physical training of young people of the different sexes... Separate education of boys and girls will be extremely important in strengthening of school discipline.<sup>25</sup>

### Further Comparisons with Nazi Techniques

The importance of the childbearing family, the stress on military education (boys on the junior high school level receive two hours of military training daily) and the strengthening of discipline provided the actual reasons for the elimination of co-education.

The analogy with Nazi education here is quite obvious. For the Nazis a woman is primarily a childbearer and the first obligation of man is his military duty.

20. *Choosing a Career in Soviet Schools*, B. King, p. 16.

21. *Press Department Voks*, 1940.

22. *Russia From A to Z*, by A. Freund and *Russia Goes to School*, by B. King.

23. *Soviet Politics At Home and Abroad*, F. L. Schuman.

24. *Changing Man*, 1937. *Soviet Child in Wartime*, 1943.

25. *The Primary School*, Nachatnya Shkola, Aug.-Sept., 1943.

A Nazi nursery rhyme:

What puffs and patter  
What clicks and clatter  
I know what, oh what fun  
Its a lovely Gatling gun

The Russian prose version:

Already in the primary school work is conducted for the purpose of equipping the pupils with those elements of general knowledge which are closely related to the military preparation of future warriors.<sup>26</sup>

The difference between the German and Russian attitude is that in Germany the inferiority of women was an open and expressed doctrine while in Russia equality of women is the official doctrine while inequality is the functioning one.<sup>27</sup> The reason for this is a political one. Stalinism appeals to progressive sentiments; therefore, it must cloak its reactionary actions with progressive verbalisms. In Russia, working class women must not only bear and rear children for the state but must

26. *Sovetskaiia Pedagogika*, 1943. (See *I Want to be Like Stalin*, by Counts, p. 68.)

27. Russian women are not discriminated against in higher education. This applies, as we have seen, to daughters of the bureaucracy. Sexual equality functions predominantly for daughters of the rich who can afford higher education.

also share the burden of factory labor. The equality which Russian women share with men is the equality of greater sacrifice. Those realms in which women have sought traditionally to express their rights, namely, the right to divorce, abortion and co-education, are closed to them.

We have presented above the depressing realities of Russian education. A whole generation of Russians is being reared to become obedient and patriotic automatons. It is essential to remember, however, that formal education is only one aspect of the education and development of a human being. His own experience is, in a sense, far more powerful in shaping his attitude and determining his actions. The power of the printed word is extensive but is still limited by the naked fact. The iron dictatorship which the Russian bureaucracy maintains over the masses, its totalitarian control of art, literature and the sciences is proof enough of the confidence of the state in the efficacy of its educational methods. Education is truly "learning through experience" and the misery of the Russian people may evoke a hatred of their rulers which will determine, in the long run, the fate of the dictatorship.

Gertrude BLACK

Gertrude Black is a graduate student at Hunter College.

## A Conflict In Earnest

### *A Writer's Reflections On Naturalism And Supernaturalism*

**THERE IS A DIALOGUE** that goes on in me all the time, and finds me taking sometimes one side, sometimes the other. This is a little like playing chess with oneself or solitaire: "I'm always cheating." The difference is that the game does not end, and while there's no reason that it should end, I would like it to; I would like to reach a conclusion. The real difference is that it is wrong to refer to this as a game or a dialogue—it is a conflict in earnest.

Call the two sides naturalism, the belief in progress, the perfectibility of man, science and reason; and anti- or supernaturalism, the belief in damnation, religion and unreason. These two sides, in varying degree, oppose each other in any age, because they oppose each other, in varying degree, in any man of that age. Do I have the representative proportion? This is not a serious question, because if I want to reach a solution, all that should matter to me is the solution. Moreover, the possibility remains that it is not wise to solve this conflict, that it should be maintained and enjoyed (in an age as in a man) for its own sake. But before one can speak of this matter it is first necessary to attempt the solution.

I find, in me and around me, two kinds of defense of naturalism and two kinds of attack upon it: philosophical and empirical. Of the empirical defense it is easiest to dispose. This should be more or less as follows: that there is real, matter-of-fact evidence of progress; that history shows us how man has become more perfect; that this progress and perfection are the result of science; and, accordingly, of reason, which is gaining an ever greater influence in human affairs. People who argue this way are called liberals. There are no perfect living examples, but there are many who approach this ideal, as a limit. They merit the reputation of fatuity or philistinism.

For the empirical evidence is all to the contrary. There has been no progress, except in such departments as refrigerators and washing machines, and factories for producing them; instruments of warfare and of wholesale murder—i.e., man has made progress, simultaneously, in the art of making life easier and in the art of making it impossible, which is another way of saying he has made none at all. There has been real progress in medicine and allied arts and sciences, but even in the ideal case this would probably not be enough to outweigh the counter-evidence; as it is, people still die like flies. And since there is no reason to believe in material progress, such as there has been cannot be used as evidence for moral progress. This disposes of the empirical defense, and thereby justifies the empirical attack.

Philosophically, the argument, to present the attack first, runs more or less like this. The reason there is no empirical evidence for this doctrine is that this doctrine is false. But naturalism is not only a false philosophy, it is a dangerous one. Those evils which so far outweigh the good in human history are the direct consequences of naturalistic premises. The Terror and Napoleon are the result of the Enlightenment; the Soviet slave state and Stalin, of Marxism. All this, and our constantly recurring wars and disasters, can be traced to an error, the error, call it, of scientific sentimentalism. This lies in making man a natural object, on a part with any other, and delivering him piecemeal to the various sciences for study. Thus, we obtain knowledge of man from sociology, economics, political science, anthropology, biology, psychology, etc. But we obtain only a composite knowledge, in the course of acquiring which we destroy the distinctive category of man as such. This makes it impossible to know man as man. We therefore

say that there is no essential human nature, there are only the several propositions about man gathered from several sciences. Having no conception of human nature as such, we fail to see that it is essentially evil; that it must be controlled, restrained, governed in terms of superior, abiding principles; that to give it freedom on a naturalistic basis, trusting in its rational self-interest, its self-development, is to allow every irrationality, every destructive impulse, every evil lurking in man, to break through in force, as it has invariably done in the course of history. How can we see that man is damned when we can't see *man*; how see that he must be saved, when there is nothing to save?

Obviously, a set of scientific propositions is neither saved nor damned, it is morally neutral; and the subject matter of these propositions, man as a natural object, on a par with any other that may be studied, is also morally neutral, featureless, non-existent. So that man commits crime and atrocity with full intent, and yet always escapes, for there are always "circumstances," "causes," "environment," "conditioning" — which means that man does not exist. But not content with having rendered man non-existent, naturalism goes on to declare that this monster it has created is good. Since each science can work out its separate problems and always, in time, achieve the desired result, and this is good, it follows, to the egregious sentimentalism of science, that the sum total is also something that can be worked out, achieved, and this, too, is good.

Man, in other words, is non-existent, therefore neutral, therefore perfectible, therefore good! And so every crime is justifiable. Therefore, let us have more wars, more progress, more bloodshed, more perfection, more sin, more science. But if the bloodshed is to stop, we must destroy this infamous sentimentality, this cunningly neutral perversion, and see human nature for what it is—fallen and degraded, beset with original sin. Only by the grace of God, and only by faith in Him, shall man, who does not exist in science but exists only in His image, not in time, not in the world, but in eternity—only by faith shall man be saved, the blood spilled over history, redeemed, and history itself, fulfilled.

And the answer to this is that it is a doctrine of consolation. It is advanced from a modern perspective; it does not assert, "God's in His heaven and all's well with the world"; it does not make the relation between man and God easy and snug, but an extremely difficult and paradoxical one; all the same, this is a comforting belief. It offers its adherents the consolation of not appearing to seek consolation, and thus it consoles them by telling them they are brave. Examine its tenets and operations singly, and the impression of bravery fails. First, the removal of man from nature. This offers the anti-naturalists the advantage of a closed perspective, within which everything that is asserted is safe from intrusion from other perspectives; the constant questioning, the check and recheck that goes on in science. Secondly, these assertions, thereby freed of responsibility to fact, can be made at will: they are entirely preferential, moral and religious preferences. One *prefers* to call man morally degraded by nature, for then the system of morality advocated requires divine intervention. Since man can only destroy what is good, we call in God to uphold our conception of the good. In so doing, in lifting man out of nature and time, we can give our weariness with further secular effort the appearance of wisdom: we know what man is, we won't be fooled any more. This weariness next acquires the semblance of a higher sensibility—such vulgarities as material progress, perfectability, reason, ugh! Addressing itself solely to

spirit, it appropriates the patent of a greater seriousness: Who cares about material trivialities? The spirit of man is our concern!

Next comes the poetry of reaction: simple-minded liberalism, which cannot see beyond ballots and playgrounds, cannot attain to the tragic view of life; the tragic view of life requires a deep acquaintance with the *reality* of evil (under whose aegis its *inevitability* is sneaked in). Now as meliorism cannot remove the essential evil in man, what have we to do with measures of mere reform? We are the true revolutionists, we advocate a spiritual revolution as well as a secular one. Which is a wonderful rationalization for doing nothing, and as often happens, for supporting reaction in the guise of waiting for something "truly" revolutionary to come along. Meanwhile, the whole revolutionary past is castigated, the Russian Revolution (not only for Stalinism, but for its original socialist ideals), Marxism, the French Revolution, the Enlightenment, etc.—as though in the whole of history not one thing "truly" revolutionary has as yet turned up. Blame everything on Rousseau and hurrah for original sin! These maneuvers give the opposition considerable moral and psychological advantages. It is worth giving up a little immediate comfort and consolation to wait for this to roll in.

But to return to the original premises of naturalism, these assert that there can be nothing "truly" revolutionary, which separates man from nature. Kierkegaard, existentialism (of religious variety, though the same is true of the secular in lesser degree), avant-garde Catholicism, the entire present-day religious revival perpetrate this trick. They offer varieties of exemption from science, from the piecemeal knowledge of man, which is the only knowledge there is. But we want neither exemption nor consolation, we will take our chances with the scientific method of discovering truth, and if this commits us to a belief in progress and perfectability (as I believe it does), why, then, what's the harm in that? None, so long as it does not become a dogma, or manufacture evidence out of the mere hope. But to hope for progress is not disgrace. In doing so, one merely follows nature, "where there's life there's hope" —or a certain amount of it, anyway. This it seems to me is much braver than the sentimental turn-about which, reacting against its own weakness, banishes hope entirely, and insists, as a matter of principle, on damnation.

Where do I stand in all this? I love the 19th century and hate to see it go. It is the longest and most fruitful in history, having begun with the Enlightenment, and lasted down to the present-day religious revival, which marks its close. As a 19th century intellectual (of the very kind that Dostoyevsky ridiculed!) I believe in progress, perfectability, science, reason, etc., with the qualifications that come of living in the 20th century. I am all for the Enlightenment, all for Jean Jacques Rousseau. Throw out the dialectic, the belief in inevitability,

## ALTERNATIVE

*Libertarian Pacifist Monthly*

Send for free copies:

P. O. BOX 827

Church Street Station

New York 8, N. Y.

dictatorship by the working class or anybody else, the doctrine of a permanent, unshifting class structure in capitalist society, the belief that a workers' state is necessarily preferable to a boss state (for the issue is the state in *any* form), and the desire for revolution by force and violence; throw these things out and make room for psychoanalysis, and for the recognition that psychic health is not altogether a matter of producing the right social and economic environment, but that under any kind of environment there is still an absolute difference between neurotic and healthy sexuality—and I am even something of a Marxist, if this makes sense. But if so, what's all the shooting about? Why, the man's a plain catch-basin liberal; expose him, disown him—him, with his "conflict in earnest"!

But not so fast. For still there come rolling back to me as over a barrier, a breakwater, waves of disgust with this reasonableness, this well balanced "solution." The significant word is "barrier." Am I trying to protect myself? I who will have nothing to do with the consoling doctrines of despair—isn't this "barrier" but another consolation? Break it down, let the disgust flood in. There, science is washed away, and now reason is eroded, it is undermined and falls. I, too, am writing a poetry of reaction. I, too, am weary and bored and would welcome damnation, and what hope is there without God? I, too, must face death, which I fear and abhor, my own death, not anyone else's, and this makes me pull up short in my social environment, and I stand alone, absolutely alone, "without wife or child." But this is only the reaction. It is still not the "conflict in earnest."

The conflict in earnest is calm, it goes on without distraction, without dry reason or the flooding disgust. The conflict

in earnest exists only when all the forces, of either hand, are in control; and in control not in virtue of striving or discipline, but when they lend themselves, of their own accord. Then one strives for a "solution"—but it is not the one or the other, it has nothing to do with either. For if this strangely warring calm is the real conflict, then the real peace is also of a different order, having nothing to do with the forced treaties, the prevailing of one side against the other. The real peace comes in moments (as yet so far apart!) and then to be alive is a blessing. Then the "conflict" is nonsense, it is neurotic, it does not exist—and neither does naturalism or anti-naturalism, or religion, or science. The work goes well, love is strong, one is capable of so much. Then it is not a question of action or inaction—one feels so much more keenly the world's injustice and acts against it so much the more wisely. But again it is not a question of "wisdom." To feel this way is wise, and that's all that wisdom means. The rest is folly.

These are moments of joy, and perhaps they can be extended into a lifetime, even within one's lifetime. These are the moments of nature, when things come of themselves, and then there is a natural religion, a natural work to do, a natural scientific curiosity. This is the only solution. Therefore, may the real conflict continue to rage in earnest.

ISAAC ROSENFELD

Isaac Rosenfeld is a guest contributor. He is the author of *Passage from Home* and a contributor to *Kenyon Review*, *Partisan Review* and other magazines.

## Cold War In The Labor Movement

### *Russian-American Rivalry Reflected In The CIO Split*

**NOWHERE IS THE PROBLEM** of Stalinism more important or posed more clearly than in the labor movement. If Stalinism is a disease of decaying capitalist society, the labor movement is its center of infection.

Stalinism derives from the labor movement; it bases itself upon and makes its main appeal to it. Without the labor movement Stalinism is nothing. It has no roots of its own in the capitalist world, hence its parasitic existence in the organized working class. The ability of Stalinism to play any kind of a role in capitalist countries rests upon its ability to assume leadership in the legitimate struggles of the workers in order to subvert them to its own purposes. But it is precisely in those cases where the Stalinists are able to lead the labor movement that they can extend their influence beyond it. They can then offer more than just an ideology to middle class intellectuals, teachers, lawyers and students. They can offer an identification with and a role in the great working class struggles which they claim to lead and unfortunately often do lead.

The efforts of the labor movement in the United States to rid itself of the Stalinist form of corruption reached a new and decisive stage at the eleventh convention of the CIO recently held in Cleveland. The split between the Stalinist and anti-Stalinist forces which had been developing in that organization finally occurred. With the withdrawal and subsequent expulsion of two Stalinist-led unions (the United Electrical

and Farm Equipment), machinery was put in motion for the ultimate separation of all the Stalinist-led unions from the main body of the CIO. Although not yet fully consummated, the essential character of the split is already clear. It merits serious analysis. It presents important lessons on how to fight Stalinism and vital implications for the whole future of labor.

#### **Basic Causes of Conflict**

Although the basic cause of the split in the CIO has been obscured by the tactical maneuvering between the two camps, it lies in the deep-seated conflict between the interests of Stalinism and the interests of the reformist leadership of the union. In the early days of the CIO, the movement was still young and undeveloped and the jockeying of these two forces for position never reached the open split stage. Submerged during the war, the antagonism was intensified by the "cold war" between American and Russian imperialism.

The Stalinists are not interested in the needs of the American working class. The sole aim of the Communist Party in gaining influence in the trade unions is to use them as rostrums for gaining support of Russian policy and where necessary as instruments of that policy. They are not interested in trade union democracy or the health of the trade union movement. Although operating under the banner of independent working class action, they slavishly follow every twist and turn

of the Moscow line. Regardless of the consequences to the labor movement, they will promote strikes recklessly when Kremlin policy demands it and oppose them just as vigorously when the line changes. The shore of history is cluttered with the ruins of once strong labor unions washed in on the Stalinist tide.

Having conquered strategic positions of influence in the CIO, the CP was determined to utilize them in helping to prosecute the Russian side of the "cold war." But two waves of anti-Stalinism combined to make such a course impossible inside the CIO. One was the rising tide of rank-and-file opposition to the Stalinists in one union after another. The other was the more belated drive of the top CIO officials. It should be understood that while the opposition of Murray and Reuther, etc., to the Stalinists is motivated largely by their support of American imperialism, they can in no way be compared to the Stalinists. While supporting American capitalism, they remain dependent for their social position, and what special privileges they may have, on the strength and power of the organized labor movement. As its leaders, they can and must fight—in their own fashion, to be sure—to defend the rights of unions. They yield to the pressure of their own supporters and carry on strikes and political struggles to improve the conditions of the working class, even when it means coming into conflict with the very government which they support. In however timid, compromising and inadequate a way, they serve the interests of labor.

#### **The Anti-Stalinist Struggle**

But the fight against Stalinism in the CIO was not begun by Philip Murray or any other of its leaders. For years rank-and-file oppositions have fought bitterly to get rid of rotten CP union administrations or those that collaborated with the CP. The wildcat strike movements and the fight against the "No Strike Pledge" during the war (in the UAW in particular), destroyed the influence of Stalinism over the most advanced militants in the CIO. Although the Stalinists and the official leadership were united on wartime policy, the Stalinists (in accordance with Russian policy) outdid themselves in the execution of strike breaking policies. They even went so far as to propose an extension of the wartime "No Strike Pledge" as a permanent feature of trade union policy. Whereas most of the ordinary conservative officials found it expedient to compromise with the rank-and-file opposition movements which arose out of the wartime inequality of sacrifice program, the Stalinists met them head-on and became the employers' favorite police force against union militants. Piecework and incentive pay systems, traditionally opposed by the labor movement, were revived as a Stalinist contribution to the war effort.

The most militant workers learned through experience the nature of the anti-labor, anti-union role of the Communist Party. At the war's end, the CP in the UAW died at the hands of an aroused membership. In the National Maritime Union and the Transport Workers Union the membership rallied around former CP fellow travelers who had broken with the Stalinists. In the UE, the opposition grew from year to year and at the time of the CIO convention was able to claim the support of a majority of members.

Faced with these rank-and-file uprisings, the Stalinists used every method possible to retain their control in those unions which they led. They forced small splits in the UE, the Public Workers, the UOPWA and the FE; they moved bureaucratically against oppositionists, expelling anti-Stalinist leaders

and locals. Although faced with a steady whittling away of their memberships, the Stalinist union bureaucracy was willing to remain in the CIO as long as it was able to put forward its line freely. But as the opposition of the CIO top leadership to the Stalinists grew, this became impossible. A split was inevitable.

The leaders who are today taking the lead in the drive to oust the Stalinists from the CIO are, with the exception of some of the Reutherites, the same conservative leaders who, during the war, tolerated and protected them. As long as the CP followed the War Deal policy of the CIO, Murray and his subalterns overlooked the anti-labor crimes of the Stalinists. Stalinist totalitarian rule, in this period, was not only tolerated but even applauded by Murray.

Murray himself did not, until recently, participate in the rising anti-CP movements within the Stalinist-controlled unions. In the UAW, Reuther was able to defeat the Stalinists despite the fact that their candidate was known to have the unofficial endorsement of Murray. In the UE, Murray kept his man, Carey (former UE president and leader of the anti-Stalinist caucus) out of UE politics for some time. Up to the very last moment, Murray would not endorse the opposition in the UE. He avoided the rank-and-file awakening.

Murray gave no material aid to the rank-and-file anti-Stalinist struggle, even though he wanted CP control eliminated, because to rely on the rank-and-file is alien to his own bureaucratic conceptions. Out of their struggle against Stalinism, the rank-and-file developed new programs and new leaders. They became more self-confident and more independent. They represented just as much of a challenge and danger to the conservative bureaucracy as to the Stalinists. It was the anti-Stalinist caucus in the UAW which put forward the concept of independent labor action and the labor party more vigorously than it had ever been raised in the CIO. It was the struggle and the program of this caucus which pushed the Reuthers and the Mazeys into such prominence and made them a serious threat to Murray's leadership. Although the UAW is the best example of this process, similar developments have taken place in the UE, the NMU, etc. Murray's opposition to the Stalinists could only take the form of, first, pleas to support CIO policy, to refrain from advocating their own line, then, threats and finally, bureaucratic ultimatums.

#### **The Bureaucratic Approach**

Bureaucratic methods of fighting Stalinism as practiced by government agencies and academic institutions tend to penetrate the labor movement. The methods employed by Murray to end the Stalinist problem in the CIO are bureaucratic in approach and outlook. The principle that affiliated unions, city and state councils must follow CIO policy on all questions, particularly political questions, was introduced at the CIO convention; presumably aimed at the Stalinist leaders of the CIO, it is no less useful to Murray in that it can be equally directed against all anti-Stalinist militants, socialists or radicals who may at any time challenge his leadership. The dangers of this new CIO "law" are obvious.

Although the acute, immediate problem in the CIO is the problem of Stalinism, a long-term, chronic problem in the labor movement as in the nation as a whole, is the defense of democracy and democratic rights. The union movement in particular thrives on democracy. A spirit of loyal criticism has always characterized the CIO and has been largely responsible for the great advances in program and outlook which that union has made over the AFL. Had Murray's concept

been accepted by trade union leaders 10 years ago, the CIO would never have come into being. Nor would much of its "official" program exist, for many of the points now accepted as "good union policy" by the whole CIO, were originally put forward by individual unions in opposition to the CIO leadership. There is in all unions a tendency toward conservatism and solidification of bureaucracy as the organization grows older and "matures." Any union which does not successfully resist this tendency will find itself unable to grapple with new problems that arise. The AFL was not able to resist that tendency; hence the need for the CIO. In the UAW, traditionally the vanguard of American labor, there are already evidences of this tendency, and in the NMU, the Curran leadership, unable to solve a serious unemployment situation, answers its critics with wholesale expulsions, sluggings and crude slander. The Murray approach to union democracy can only hasten the degeneration of the CIO.

Bureaucratic procedures against the CP make it possible for the official leadership to ignore the rank and file and escape the obligation to defend its policies before the membership by linking all critics to the Stalinists, in one way or another. Such an atmosphere makes it impossible for unions like the United Mine Workers or the ILGWU ever to join the CIO. Labor unity, vital to the labor movement's future, is only possible where unions with different points of view can exist side by side in one organization, competing freely for the support of the ranks. Whereas the ILGWU is today under great pressure in the AFL for following a dissident political policy, it cannot be expected to switch to the CIO only to receive a different brand of the same bitter medicine.

But isn't this, after all, the only practical approach to the question of Stalinism? No! It is, as a matter of fact, the least practical of all approaches. It plays into the hands of the Stalinists. The history of Stalinism shows that it derives its strength from the inability of capitalism to solve the problems of society and the lack of a positive, progressive anti-capitalist program on the part of the labor movement. The workers who now support Stalinism must be *won over* by a superior program. The Murray concept precludes the development of such a program. If the UAW, for example, tries to break ground for a new political policy, the formation of an independent labor party, it will find itself running headlong into the opposition of the Murray leadership. A really independent labor program, intent on solving economic, political and social problems without regard for the consequences to existing vested interests, would automatically remove the basis of Stalinism's existence in the labor movement. But the shakeup accompanying the development of such a program would no less adversely affect the present CIO leadership.

Although the bureaucratic methods of Murray and his machine were not the sole cause of the split in the CIO, they gave the Stalinists added strength and made the process of withdrawing easier for them. The continued existence of the CP in the CIO was impossible. Murray's new line prevented the Stalinists from executing their primary task in the labor movement. They could not compromise with the new line; neither could they accept a long range struggle against it. Although their expulsion from the CIO and retreat to purely CP-controlled unions represents a narrowing of their base, Russian interests dictate that they appear as the leaders of unions. Even if these unions will not impress the American labor movement, they can be made to appear impressive in Europe by Stalinist propagandists. While choosing a split as

the only way to preserve a pro-Kremlin front in the labor movement, the CP was able to promote factional advantage around a banner of "democracy" and "autonomy." The most frequent violators of both union democracy and autonomy, the Stalinists were able to rally thousands of non-Stalinists to their side. By appearing at the head of the parade in the fight against Murray's bureaucratism they were able to pose, as they have to do, as "the only real defenders of democracy."

### Democracy Must Be Maintained

If Stalinism is to be defeated in the labor movement it must be defeated politically. Essential to this are open discussions wherein the real meaning of Stalinism can be exposed. Besides being undemocratic and harmful for *any* organization, the expulsion of CPers for their political views (or not following "the line") is unnecessary. There is not a Stalinist leader anywhere who has not committed *real* crimes against the labor movement, who has not broken strikes, abused the privileges of office and ruined unions which could not be controlled. It is for these things that they should be expelled, if at all. Open the record of Stalinism to public view, organize and educate the rank and file in a democratic struggle and Stalinism is ruined. This is the method which was used so successfully in the UAW. The Stalinists in that union were only able to rally a handful of workers to their defense; they were not able to split and they were not given a chance to pose as martyred democrats. They were utterly crushed and defeated. And this lesson repeats itself. Many UAW leaders now go along with Murray's method of fighting Stalinism.

The lessons to be learned from the split in the CIO can be extended beyond the field of trade unionism. The fight against Stalinism must be conducted everywhere but only if conducted democratically will it be successful.

The labor movement has an unfulfilled obligation to society. It is beginning to awaken to the fact that it must concern itself with more than simple economic problems; its scope extends to every corner of life: housing, education, even peace. More and more, people look toward it for leadership and organization. Its base is so broad that in solving the problems of its members it cannot help but speak for all of us. Given a bold, new program it will lead the nation. It cannot allow itself to be weakened by loss of democracy. As one anti-Stalinist UAW member said at a recent CIO conference, "When democracy dies, our union dies. When the union dies, so does hope for a better world."

Justin GROSSMAN

Justin Grossman is a student at the New School for Social Research and a member of the United Automobile Workers of America, CIO.

## The LIBERTARIAN SOCIALIST

### Contents:

The War Threat .....Virgil Vogel  
Workers' Control at the Shop Level....Bob Bone  
Parliament, Parties and Revolution..Otto Ruehle  
and other articles

20¢ per copy

six issues—one dollar

Write to:

BOX 770, GPO, NEW YORK 1, N. Y.

## Renaissance Man: 1950

—Who will say good-night to me?  
Who will come to the beach with me  
And help me count the grains of sand?  
I have traveled a million miles upward  
Along the lines of printed pages  
And my eyes have been left blinded  
By the brilliance of the galaxies.  
I've hurled myself against the waves  
Thinking it the most personal issue:  
After the giants slapped me down  
They left me to the undertow

These are my reasons  
And here is my answer:  
St. Patrick's is a wedding-cake—

A deserter in the last retreat  
He had heard the songs of earth, the tears of men  
The tears of earth, the songs of men  
The songs and tears of men  
He had heard  
But he stopped his ears and ran  
And now he sits  
Thin  
Clean-shaven (thinking now and then  
Of bearded men) as a floor-walker:  
An observer on a wooden chair  
Watching the dancer above him  
As her orange gown swirls,  
Creating miniature patterns of its own  
That match the major movements of the dance:  
An observer on a wooden chair  
Discomfited by intellect and desire.

—Motioned mass  
Child-woman miss  
Attracting  
Contracting into a question mark,  
Answer to my every answer.  
Listen  
And be pleased with this:  
*Because to be is not to be*  
*But doing*  
*And moving*  
*And loving*  
*Is.*  
*Come witness the death of abstractions*  
*Come down and agree with me!*  
No descent, no descent  
But higher and higher away.  
A pirouette—yes!—but no descent.  
—To die a hundred times a day  
For this moment or that age  
Is, I should say, all worthwhile  
And I would die without any moans  
And allow my blood sucked dry  
But where's the present?  
Its daily passing count  
Makes my hundred only drunkard-rich  
And the future's obscured to my blind-shot eyes  
By more blood  
Than monsters can possibly drink

*These are my reasons*  
*And here is my question:*  
*Can you keep dancing forever?—*

Ralph MARCUS

## Tree on the Pause

The tree without motion on the pause of a wind,  
Still before the sun's scuttering late light,  
Free of the vagrancies of birds and squirrels  
And the small boys who want to go out on a limb  
To scan the ground from a teetering height  
That returns the low people to smallboyhood.  
And exalts small boys to a minute monarchy  
Over the surpassed terrain and freedom of the strong  
Executive mothers who do not look up, the tree waits  
As if pausing between birds, squirrels, and boys,  
In vacancy, having nothing now but leaves and limbs.

Ben-Ami SCHARFSTEIN

The autumn trees are bright  
wounds,  
profuse pantomime,  
mimicking death,  
mimicking man;  
cremated by cold winds, they  
relinquish their burning  
leaves  
and smile at wind and sky;  
their bareness belittles  
death and the beyond.  
While man,  
at season's end,  
ferments, wine for the  
wanton worms, concubine  
for clay, and is sealed  
in sleep, his insatiable  
eyelids glued to crimson leaves.

Stanley FISCHER

## Idle Gossip Sinks Admirals

Not until they are maimed do they think  
and now at last man is turning to man  
in mine, steel factory and shop,  
saying, Is this the best *we* can do  
to build the commune of the world?  
From the fire of a star they have come  
hurt now (steel sleeved or  
only the scar of mind); the wound equates  
thought for the universe.  
Returning, pierced the gates of flame  
by the word *World-law*,  
the magic phrase. In quiet rooms  
grave men with unkempt hair are  
thinking: the state of the world, the greed . . .

—Oh everywhere  
cleanse the dark speech of those  
who are literate (and dangerous)  
who infect as germ, deadlier than The Germ itself,  
the dull. Make the hysterical aware  
that even the least word passed  
at the club, the office-room, the bar  
will infiltrate the sky, become uncaught,  
chain action of the fatal soaring flare.  
Talk is never idle, it ascends  
further than dazzling atom into space.  
Conversation-strength may bind the world  
into one thinking amity of truth.  
Men of this globe, learn of the light case  
sent from hell; acquaint the young  
with the threatened land.  
—Talk is a humbler mode of act  
but it will work; men everywhere speak,  
travel the heartless roads and in the far town  
draw from each separate brain the links of equity.

Howard GRIFFIN

How strange this night reminds me of a war!  
The moon, like a bottomless glass, a tip  
Of light searched up to cut a barrel rolled  
From air—some pilot's thirty thousand feet  
Of grave—the moon drops down,  
Falls down this night in pieces,  
Like a weird snowfall on map colored sky,  
Like grief freezing day and night together,  
Like Dark Ages hiding from a history book.

Simon PERCHIK

Ralph Marcus is a student at New York University.

Stanley Fischer is a graduate student at Brooklyn College.

Simon Perchik is a student at New York University.

Amy Geliebter is a student at Brooklyn College (evening session). She recently won the poetry award of the college literary magazine, *Voices*.

Howard Griffin has contributed to *Hudson Review* and *Accent*.

## Traveler

Clothed in gold dress of circumstance  
I sail through every yes and no  
To foreign ports unguessed at birth.  
Three pennies in the hungry coat  
Jingle a stranger's shy hello  
And keep my unsmiling skeleton  
Content with promises of food.

These cities reckon with my blood  
Give subtle power to understand  
Foreign roof-tops, streets and tongue,  
Give daring to the murderer  
And all but artistry to the young,  
Character parts I play with gusto  
In *x*, the dangerous lost land.

And landed eat the ocean food  
And salt the water with my thanks—  
The skeleton, that learns to dance,  
Leans back in after-dinner ease  
Remembering the way it had to grow.  
One child it killed is twisting still  
Between the ocean's jealous hands.

Amy GELIEBTER

### Books AGAINST WAR & REGIMENTATION

- 
- COMFORT, Alex. The Powerhouse.  
Was \$3.00. With us \$1.00
- GOODMAN, Paul. The Facts Of Life.  
Was \$3.00. With us \$1.00
- OWEN, Wilfred. Poems. \$1.50
- TASHLIN, Frank. The Bear That  
Wasn't. Was \$1.25. With us .65
- ROSENFELD, Isaac. Passage From Home.  
Was \$2.50. With us .75
- REICH, Wilhelm. The Sexual Revolution.  
\$3.35
- FREUD, Sigmund. War, Sex and Neurosis.  
\$3.00
- READ, Herbert. Education Through Art.  
\$5.50
- CUMMINGS, E. E. The Enormous Room.  
\$1.25

**4 seasons-books**

21 Greenwich Ave.  
Chelsea 2-0500

New York 14  
Open to 10:30

# World Federalism Versus Socialism

## *A Student Debate On Alternative Programs*

### The Case for World Federalism

**SINCE THE DESTRUCTION** of Hiroshima by the A-bomb in August of 1945 and the advent of a cold war in the post-war period, a movement for the immediate establishment of a federal world government has had steady growth in the United States. Recently, 102 members of the House of Representatives and 21 members of the Senate sponsored a resolution urging that American foreign policy be aimed at strengthening the United Nations into a federal world government. Six states have passed bills calling for a federal convention to amend the U. S. Constitution to legally permit American entrance into a world government. United World Federalists, the largest world government organization, has tripled its membership during the last year. The most recent count in a steadily increasing climb tallied over 45,000 members, 27 state branches and 710 student and adult chapters. In June of this year, 8,000 world federalists flocked to Madison Square Garden to hear Cord Meyer, Jr., Congressman Jacob Javits, UN President Carlos Romulo and Justice William O. Douglas, all leading federalists.

World Federalists offer a powerful and convincing argument for world government. Their position rests on a number of very basic propositions, four of which we will discuss in this article. The first proposition is that the absence of government leads to the perpetuation of conditions which lead to war; the second, that the achievement of a world government will lessen infinitely the possibility of another war; the third, that world government can be obtained now; and finally, that there is no other realistic solution to the problem of obtaining world peace.

There is often a great deal of misunderstanding among opponents of world government about the World Federalist position on the causes of war. World Federalists most certainly do not believe that the cause of war is world anarchy. The real sources of war are many: they are economic, dynastic, imperialistic power driven, religious and the thousand and one conditions that lead to conflict between men. International anarchy does two things: first, it permits these conditions to lead to war; and second, it leads to an increase in the number and intensity of such conflicts. For instance, socialists often argue that capitalistic competition on a world level leads to war. Though this is true, it is an incomplete story. Within the nation state we find the same capitalists struggling for markets and profits, but we do not find this resulting in civil wars. That the nation-state grew out of a series of bloody struggles does not in any way negate the proposition that today competing capitalists are able to remain at peace—so long as they are within the same nation. The reason is obvious: a government capable of enforcing laws exists on the national level, whereas on an international level there is anarchy. Thus, governments do not abolish the conditions leading to war, but they do set up the institutions under which some of these basic problems can be dealt with.

#### **World Government to Prevent Collision**

Nor are World Federalists naive enough to believe that under a world government a communist Soviet Union and a

capitalist United States could ever be in complete agreement. Chester Bowles, in a recent article in *Harper's* magazine, pointed out that the purpose of a world government is not to bring Russia and the U. S. together, but to keep them apart—to prevent the catastrophic collision that both are rapidly heading for. A world government would carefully regulate and restrict the external activities of both nations. They would be compelled to abolish their huge armies—or at least reduce them to the point where they were only sufficient for internal use. All weapons of mass destruction would have to be under world government control. The world government would have a world police force, taxing power, the authority to prepare colonial areas for independence, and a legislature, executive agency and a judiciary capable of enacting, interpreting and enforcing world law.

The world government would have the authority, with the consent of the nations involved, to build huge power authorities like the TVA throughout the world in addition to aiding through technical aid and financial assistance in the development of undeveloped areas. The danger that such powers could be used by the Soviet Union or the United States for their own ends would be greatly lessened by placing the control of the majority of the votes in the hands of the non-capitalist, non-communist middle world—particularly Asia led by Nehru and possibly a socialist West Europe. This middle world has nothing to gain and a world to lose by a conflict between the great powers. In addition, it should be noted that a world government could not possibly have the powers to legislate communism or capitalism out of existence or *interfere in the domestic activities of a state* without the consent of that state. Opponents of world government often fail to understand precisely what powers must be surrendered to a world government. This misunderstanding leads to the mistaken belief that the Soviet leaders would have to surrender their totalitarianism. None of the powers listed above would destroy the Soviet leaders' control over their own country. The mainstay of their power—the police force—could still be maintained, but they would lose their vast army and thus their power to declare war. In return the Soviet Union would be guaranteed against military attack. As desirable as it might be to outlaw totalitarianism it would, at this time, be completely impossible nor could the great powers be expected to join a world government with extensive powers over internal activities. If the reader is particularly interested in studying further the functions and powers of a world government, he is recommended to read Emery Reves' *Anatomy of Peace*, Vernon Nash's *The World Must Be Governed*, and particularly Chicago University's *Preliminary Draft of a World Constitution* and the University of Chicago's monthly magazine, *Common Cause*.

It all sounds fine, you may say, but how do we get the Soviet Union and the U. S. to join a world government? It must be noted that the lack of consent by these two great powers is, at this time, the only major obstacle to world government since the leaders of France, Britain, Italy, the Philippines, Australia, Canada and India have already indicated their support. Many socialists have pointed out that American

capitalists will never permit the U. S. to favor a world government which, by destroying imperialism and colonialism, might presage the end of capitalism. But no amount of repetition can make a truth of the dogma that the capitalist class alone rules this country and, like the Almighty, can do what it pleases. Though it would be foolish to deny that capitalists have had a disproportionate influence in the government, they cannot govern without the cooperation of the farmers, labor and the middle class. Few of the New Deal laws or the constitutional amendments (particularly the income tax amendment) were imposed by the capitalist class. The faith of democrats—and the validity of the argument lies in the success of the labor and socialist leaders in England, Scandinavia, New Zealand and Australia—is that a reasonable case, reasonably presented, will eventually win the hearts of a majority of the people. Reject this faith and totalitarianism becomes inevitable.

The Soviet leaders cannot reject a proposal for world government with the ease with which they have rejected the Baruch Plan. They will have to recognize the force the idea of world government possesses for the millions of Asiatics who wish to end imperialism and the millions who wish security from war. Stalin must recognize as Victor Hugo once noted, that no army can stop an idea whose time has come. And, we may add, neither can a totalitarian state nor its propaganda machine. Furthermore, no one has yet indicated with scientific precision the future actions of any nation. Nor can we be final about any conclusions on the motivations of the Soviet Union. The sheer necessity for survival requires that we adopt the more optimistic and the more hopeful approach; if we adopt the fatalistic approach that the Soviet Union desires and is willing to fight for control of the United States, then a catastrophic Third World War is inevitable and, we may well add, the destruction of both Eastern and Western civilizations. If we adopt the approach that the two systems can co-exist in the same world we may then adopt the policies which will make such an existence possible. But we shall discuss the question of Russia in more detail later.

#### Four Steps to World Government

What steps must the U. S. take to obtain world government? There are four such steps.

**Step One:** The U. S. must be firmly committed to the idea of world government. This means that a strong World Federalist movement and strong public support must be built in this country. This means a shift in the control of the American legislature and executive to those who support our program. Federalists are fortunate in having the active support of a number of possible presidential candidates including Justice William O. Douglas, Governor Chester Bowles, Senator Humphrey and UAW President Walter Reuther. The United States must declare to the world that the fundamental objective of American foreign policy is to seek the development of the United Nations into a federal world government.

**Step Two:** Attempts must be made to ease the tension between ourselves and the Soviet Union. UNESCO is now doing extensive work on the problem of tension between nations. United World Federalists are talking about the possibility of an overall settlement between the East and West. The American Friends Service Committee in a recent report on Soviet-American relations made several excellent suggestions for easing tensions. First, they said, the U. S. must drop its restrictions on American exports to East Europe and must work for renewal of trade between the East and West. Second, Truman's

"Point Four" proposal must be supervised through the United Nations and should include, if possible, Eastern European countries. Third, increased efforts to obtain cuts in armaments should be made. These are only a few suggestions. There are many others toward easing tensions—steps that must be taken to prepare the ground for eventual agreement to establish a world government.

**Step Three:** The United States, or possibly India or some other middle power, should call an "Exploratory Conference" to consider changing the UN into a world government. Such a conference would be similar to the one held at Dumbarton Oaks. No nation need commit itself though each nation could express its position on world government and describe the changes in the charter it favored.

**Step Four:** The U. S. or some other nation should then call for a conference of the UN under Article 109 of the charter to revise the UN into a world government. The charter provides that such a conference be convened in 1955 if a majority of the member nations so vote.

The new constitution would then be sent to each nation for ratification. Its support by the U. S. would insure overwhelming ratification. Russian support would make it almost unanimous.

#### Reasons Why Russia Might Join

Will Russia join? There are several reasons why she might.

(1) Security from foreign invasion would give the Soviet Union the opportunity to reduce its huge military machine and use her production for capital and consumer goods for

### UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.

7 East 12th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

"There is no compromise, really between government and non-government. No safe middle ground. The middle ground looks alluring, because it is close at hand, well groomed, and cheap; but it must eventually be crossed. We are in mid-passage today, a tricky woment in time."

E. B. WHITE, *The Wild Flag*

#### UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.

7 East 12th Street, New York 3, N. Y.

.....Please send me further information.

.....I wish to join. Enroll me as:

.....Single Membership, \$5.00

.....Couple Membership, \$7.50

.....Student Membership, \$1.50

.....  
(school)

Name.....

Address.....

Ad Sponsored by City College Chapter, UWF

her people. The Russian leaders must soon recognize that their position cannot be secure until the Russian people have full bellies.

(2) A world government would help the Soviet Union economically. It would mean renewed East-West trade. It would mean that she could buy heavy machinery from the U. S. It would mean economic aid from a world authority.

(3) *Russian leaders may recognize that they would not lose their totalitarian power to a world government. Though they would lose their power to wage war, they would gain security against attack.*

(4) Furthermore, the Soviet Union must recognize the consequences of her failure to join a world government.

First, she would have reason to fear that even if she rejects, the other nations may proceed to form a powerful partial federation which might permanently alienate her from the middle world of India, Burma, the Philippines—in fact, most of Asia and Africa.

Second, the rejection of a world government would be a powerful propaganda weapon in the hands of the West. Her rejection might indicate to the world that the Soviet Union opposes a strengthened UN.

Third, probable entrance into a world government by Yugoslavia and perhaps even China, might frighten the Soviet leaders into believing that she could well lose her control over East Europe if she rejects a proposal for world government—and the economic benefits it would provide.

#### **Alternative Plans if Russia Rejects Proposals**

The Soviet Union might reject! We cannot discount this possibility. She might reject for at least two reasons: First, the Soviet leaders may believe that the proposal is an American capitalist plot to dominate the world, destroy their power and abolish communism. Second, they may adhere rigidly to the Marxist doctrine that peace is not the product of government but rather of certain economic forces. If the Soviet Union rejects the proposal for world government, the other nations may decide to build a partial federation, leaving the door open for the Soviet Union. Whether this is desirable or not will depend on the actions of the U. S. prior to the creation of a partial federation and what the aims of that federation are. But above all, there can be no real world government, there can be no world peace unless both the U. S. and the USSR are eventually in that world government.

If any strength lies in these Federalist arguments, I think it is in the bare fact that world government is the only realistic solution. Those who favor partial federation must realize that they far from tackle the basic problem. A union of the United States and West Europe—an Atlantic Union—would only aggravate the tension between the East and West. The creation of a European union—those who use the phrase usually means a federation of the non-communist Western European nations—would not lead to an independent unit for the foreign policy of the countries in West Europe today which are inextricably bound to the policies of the United States. No European federation at this time could be independent of either of the great powers. Nor will the attempts on the part of the United States to rearm itself lead to peace, for armament races are always followed by war.

The Truman Doctrine, the North Atlantic Military Alliance, America's repeated unilateral actions can in no way solve the problem of peace or war, for the old balance of power scheme is obsolete; and the greatest obsolescence of all in our

Atomic Age is national sovereignty. If peace with justice is to be obtained, the first great step will be taken by establishing a world government.

Myron WEINER

*Myron Weiner is president of the City College of New York chapter of the United World Federalists. He is also a member of the UWF National Student Council.*

## **The Case for Socialism**

**PROPOSONENTS OF WORLD FEDERALISM** believe that if the machinery of government were extended across national boundaries today the present war crisis would be brought to an end. Simultaneously, they admit that many conflicts which exist between the two major powers today would not be eliminated, but these countries presumably would no longer have the power to make war. Any differences of interest would have to be worked out, they maintain, in a "lawful" fashion under the supervision of a World Court.

There are few people who will deny that the principle of world government in the abstract is a worthy one. However, we are not concerned here with abstractions but with the specific content of world government provided by United World Federalists (UWF) as opposed to the socialist concept of a supra-national government.

World Federalists believe that a world government of the existing national powers is not only possible but provides the only effective method of preventing World War III. Thus, their analysis of the causes of present world tensions proceeds along these lines: (1) War is the outcome of fear and misunderstandings, (2) governments are above economic and military struggles and not inherently a part of them, and (3) world government is possible through an appeal to, and action by the present national governments.

They must accept this logical construction in an attempt to make their program a reasonable one. For if it is not true that "the present drift... is less the product of any clash of rival interests than of mutual fear,"<sup>1</sup> and if it is not true that "there is no real clash of vital interests between the Soviet Union and the United States,"<sup>2</sup> then, obviously, much more is needed than the mere legal structure of international government.

If, further, government today is *not* the arbiter of internal class conflict but a participant in it, as socialists maintain, then any world governmental structure becomes useless as a method of controlling international conflicts. Finally, if world government cannot be achieved by the present national governments, then a program for peace must have as its immediate objective not world government but a change of present national governments.

#### **Can Basic Conflicts Be Arbitrated?**

"Complacent self-righteousness is probably the main handicap to effective peace-making at any time,"<sup>3</sup> states a UWF pamphlet. Two world wars have been fought within the last few

1. *How to Achieve One World*, by James Warburg.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Yes, But...*, by Vernon Nash.

decades and a third threatens to destroy world civilization. Can we really blame it all on "complacent self-righteousness" or on "fear feeding on fear," as does Cord Meyer, Jr.? Surely, the diplomats and statesmen, evil as they may be, are not as stupid as all that. Surely they fought, leaving aside their propaganda reasons, for more material reasons than a mere state of mind. There is reason to doubt that Hitler, Stalin, Roosevelt or Truman wanted war for its own sake. But war is not an *end* in itself; it becomes a necessary *means* for maintaining national power and extending control over markets, raw materials, for political control, for "open doors," etc., without which social power *could not be maintained*. National governments do not prefer to fight over these economic necessities. However, they desire and *need* markets, raw materials, and spheres of influence, and out of the struggle for them grows war.

World Federalists make a large point of the fact that today there is competition within the capitalist class in all capitalist nations and yet there is no civil war, but arbitration and other peaceful settlements through legally established media. Therefore, they ask, why cannot competitive nations arbitrate their differences?

First of all it must be pointed out that the national bourgeois nation *did* emerge out of violence that sometimes lasted for centuries. The bourgeois national states in Italy, France, England, Germany, were almost literally conceived in blood: revolutions and civil wars which lasted whole lifetimes until one social class would establish its supremacy over another; in the cited nations, the bourgeois class over the feudal caste. Is it conceivable that in France the middle class could have taken power following an amicable discussion with the court of Louis XVI? To pick a modern example, does it not require an inordinate amount of imagination to think that the Russian revolutionary parties could have come to a peaceful agreement with Czar Nicholas?

Even within the United States, internal conflicts when they are of a *life or death* nature have been settled by force. The struggle between the industrial capitalist North and the slave-owning, agrarian South could not have been smoothed over within the framework of the constitution.

Thus the implied premise of this World Federalist argument is incorrect, not merely as a matter of theory, but as a simpler matter of historical fact. The World Federalist movement, unlike the socialist movement, bases its simple schemas on simple homilies. What literature they have put out does not attempt to probe, to analyze, to investigate the logic of politics and history. Their inability to understand the emergence of the national state is matched by their failure to grasp the often complex relationships within and between modern capitalism and Stalinism.

### Basic Contradictions Between Stalinism and Capitalism

The fact is that capitalism and Stalinism are completely different and contradictory social systems which cannot co-exist harmoniously for any extended period. Russia is faced with the absolute necessity of raising its technological levels. In order to do this, it must draw upon the resources of other nations at their expense. The plundering of the industry of Manchuria or the oppressive reparations imposed upon the subjugated nations of Eastern Europe is not merely the work of evil men. These are the operations of a government which is

consistently attempting to meet the needs of the *present* Russian state and maintain its political hegemony.

Russia must be part of the world government, UWF states. The *present* Russian regime can be made to realize the benefits it would derive from world government, they say further. But to participate, according to UWF, the Politburo would have to give up control of its armed forces, its secret police, over tariffs and currency: it would have to allow inspectors to investigate the Russian economic set-up. In short, it would have to abdicate control over the very foundations of its totalitarian rule, i.e., *commit political suicide*. But then it would no longer be the present Russian regime which the World Federalist promises us can be persuaded to join world government. That is the contradiction for UWF to resolve.

The present United States government, on the other hand, cannot afford to see the continued extension of Stalinism, which is *based* upon the elimination of private property and the physical liquidation of whole sections of the capitalist class. It has the responsibility to itself and to the American economy, as it is now organized, to keep the American dollar supreme. This objective is not a whim of the Truman administration. Without its European market, without its South American trade, without its ability to undersell potential competitors, without its ability to keep out the Russian army from Western Europe, the American economic and political system would be in a desperate plight.

### Questions to the World Federalists

How would America's profit-motivated economy fare in this World Federalist government? How would its rivalry with Russia for control of China have fared? Would the projected World Court have made a "fair" division? But then no division of China is fair: that would make the Court an international clearing house for loot. Would the World Federalist then tell us that under world government, as he sees it, Russia and the United States would not have been interested in imperialist penetration of China? Well and good, but then he is not talking about the present regimes and social systems in the United States and Russia. Until it can be proved that the present systems can abandon their programs of financial and military overlordship and conquests of weaker nations and colonies, socialists (and most other people) will continue to believe that Truman and Stalin are correct when they repeatedly point out that their respective policies of expansionism are a necessary condition for their survival.

What would the World Court proposed by UWF, which would include representatives from the existing governments, do about Russia's totalitarian control of its puppet governments in Eastern Europe and Asia? Surely the fate of these hundreds of millions of oppressed people would fall within the jurisdiction of the World Court. Would the Court defend the "rights" of Russia in Poland, China, Rumania, Hungary, etc.? That would make of the Court an international agency for the defense of tyranny. Would the Court ask Russia to surrender its political (and sometimes military) control of these nations? But is it conceivable that the *present* Russian government is going to step out of Eastern Europe deferentially and gracefully? If so, how is the Russian bureaucratic state going to increase its productive and technological levels, given its *present* totalitarian organization of economy and government? To do this would mean *first of all* a flexible, democratic regime. But the *present* regime is the antithesis of

democracy. Will totalitarian Stalinism abdicate, i.e., commit political suicide in the interests of world government, or will it have to be overthrown? But wait, it doesn't have to either abdicate or be overthrown: our World Federalist promises us that Russia with its *present* government can find a place for itself in its world government scheme. A promise which may reach fructification in the blueprint of a Federalist pamphlet, but never on this planet, for it is based on the contradiction of promising a world government of the *present* regimes under conditions which require the self-destruction of all the invited participants.

What would be the World Federalist's attitude toward a democratic underground behind the Iron Curtain? In some places these revolutionary democratic undergrounds are already engaged in military combat with the Stalinist despotism. Does the UWF support these underground workers in their efforts to overthrow the Stalinist government? But it cannot very well do that and at the same time call upon the *present* Russian government to join in world government. I am afraid that it will be rather ineffectual—to put it euphemistically—to attempt persuading the Stalin regime of the advantages to itself of world government and at the same time to support, not to mention encourage, those fighters for freedom who are giving their lives in a struggle to overthrow the Russian totalitarian government. But if our World Federalist does not support the democratic movement to overthrow it, does he support the Stalinist regime in its terroristic suppression of democratic movements? Or does he abstain from supporting one side or the other on the ground that "it's none of our business" in the worst of isolationist traditions? To be consistent the World Federalist would have to answer the above question in only one way: *no support to the democratic movements fighting for basic human rights.*

### **Socialism and Role of Socialists**

Capitalism is that competitive system wherein the means of production are privately owned and production carried on for the sake of a profit; because it is production for profit it is not planned according to the needs of the people but is determined by the unpredictable demands and lucrative returns of the market. Thus, to keep up prices and profits, food crops have been ploughed under, milk spilled and livestock destroyed in America; thus, French capitalists will invest in production of luxury items for the profitable American market rather than in consumer industries producing necessities for the French people at a cheap selling price to fit the worker's meager budget.

Stalinism is that system wherein the economy is nationalized; the state performs the function of directing and organizing production. This conscious organized, centralized production through the state apparatus, i.e., the synthesis of the political with the economic, is completely alien to the capitalist mode of production. The Stalinist bureaucratic class is responsible to no one but itself: a class of administrators, diplomats, party leaders, supervisors, etc. It maintains its authority through attempted totalitarian control over all phases of human activity. Work, sports, the arts, politics, education, sex (e.g., divorce and abortion laws in Russia) all fall under the control of the bureaucratic class. It is a system of terror in which the human being is degraded. But it is a system with contradictions, too. The fear, terror, purges, social and economic inequities, intrigues and factions based on fear, negate

in large measure the economic advantages of this bureaucratically planned economy. The factory manager and supervisor are under the constant threat of "liquidation" if production norms are not met. Consequently, statistics are falsified, poor quality goods produced, norms accepted which cannot possibly be met; disproportions in the economy therefore develop which seriously undermine national planning.

The socialist state aims at the elimination of these major features of capitalism and Stalinism. It is a system wherein the means of production will eventually be nationalized, but wherein planning will be under the democratic control of the producers. Unlike capitalism, production will not be guided by the needs of a profitable market, but by the needs of the mass of people; it will be under the conscious direction of a state which will be in turn, under the democratic controls of the people, unlike the bureaucratic planning apparatus of Russia.

Democracy is an essential part of socialism. Without democracy, there can be no socialism. In a socialist state man's creative potential will be given free rein. Music, philosophy and politics will not be chosen for him.

This freedom is more than a moral good. It is a requirement for the economy. Men and women will become conscientious workers if they know that the government belongs to them and that they are the most immediate beneficiaries of techniques and inventions which will increase the productivity of labor and raise the level of production, improve living standards and reduce the hours of manual labor, thereby allowing for the development of a cultural potential heretofore never dreamed of.

Socialism is an international philosophy. The world is economically interdependent. America needs coffee from Brazil in exchange for American manufactures. England needs food from the Continent in return for its industrial products; Germany's agriculture is not adequate for its population while Italy's manufacturing capacity is limited. The supra-national integration of these lands is an economic necessity which can be fulfilled on a socialist basis. Tariffs, cut-throat competition, production for profit—all this will be alien to states in which there will be conscious planning for use. The present mutual economic jealousies on the European continent are not the products of evil or stupid natures; they are the normal reflections of competitive capitalist states, each seeking gain at the expense of others.

Though socialists believe that the causes of modern wars can only be eliminated by a federation of socialist nations, they do not, therefore, abstain from fighting for day-to-day reforms. Nor do they repeat, as if it were a catechism, "only socialism." Socialists participate in unions, student movements, neighborhood organization and wherever else they can help the mass of people improve their conditions.

Nor do socialists maintain that a Third World War is inevitable in the coming period. Anti-war movements which are not necessarily socialist can be an effective force in combating the war drives of both power blocs. The labor unions are likewise a powerful anti-war potential; the vast majority of the world's population is war-weary—a factor which can play a major role in blocking the military plans of the American and Russian imperialist camps.

Socialists do not even refrain from making demands of "their" capitalist governments. It is only on a life-or-death issue

that a capitalist government may not give ground before mass pressure. Normally, however, a capitalist government can make concessions to organized mass movements for higher wages, democratic rights, and—for peace. In Europe, for example, within these mass movements socialists can demand of these larger organizations that they press for the organization of Western Europe (which is now caught between the American dollar and the internal and external pressure of Russian imperialism) into an *independent* bloc. An Independent Western Union could resist the financial and political invasions of both Russia and the United States.

But our debate with the UWF is not about immediate objectives as outlined above. The question actually is: Can Russian imperialism and American capitalism live with one another in peace? To this *fundamental* question, socialists say "No." The present conflict between these two powers is a life-and-death question whose *ultimate* solution lies in the reorganization of society along socialist lines.

W. WALTERS

W. Walters is the business manager of ANVIL and a student at Columbia University.

# The Sexual Initiation of Women

## *Towards The Understanding Of Feminine Sex Psychology*

**IN A SENSE** the sexual initiation of the woman like that of the man begins in earliest infancy. There is a theoretical and practical apprenticeship which goes on in an uninterrupted manner from the oral, anal, and genital phase up to maturity. But the erotic experiences of the girl are not a simple extension of her previous sexual activities; they very often have an unexpected and brutal character; they constitute a new event which creates a break with the past. At the moment that she goes through these experiences, all the problems which are posed for her are encountered in a shape both pressing and acute. In some cases the crisis is resolved with ease; but there are tragic conjunctures in which it is not resolved except by suicide or madness. Anyhow, a large part of the woman's fate is involved in the way in which she reacts. All psychiatrists agree upon the extreme importance that erotic beginnings have for the woman; its repercussions affect the remainder of her life.

This situation is utterly different for men than for women from the biological as well as from the social and psychological point of view. For men the transition from infantile sexuality to maturity is relatively simple; there is objectivation of the erotic pleasure which, instead of being realized in its inherent immanent presence, has for its intention a transcendent being. The erection is the expression of that need. With his sex, with his hands, with his mouth, with all his body, man strains toward his partner, but at the very center of this activity he remains generally as the subject in front of objects which he perceives and instruments which he manipulates; he projects himself toward the other without losing his autonomy; the feminine flesh is prey for him and he grasps in her the qualities that his sensuality demands from any object; no doubt he does not succeed in owning them: he does, however, embrace them; the caress, the kiss, imply a part-delay; but this very delay is a stimulus and a joy. The love-act finds its unity in its natural achievement, the orgasm. Coitus has a precise physiological end; by his ejaculation the male discharges the secretions that press upon him; after the sexual tension he gets a complete release which is certainly accompanied by a stroke of pleasure. And certainly pleasure was not the only aim; it is often followed by disenchantment: a discovery that rather than having been satiated, his need has vanished. In any case, a definite act has been consummated and the male has found himself again with an intact body: the service which he has rendered to the species is fused with his own pleasure.

The eroticism of the woman is much more complex and it reflects the complexity of the feminine situation. It has been seen<sup>1</sup> that instead of integrating specific forces into her individual life, the female is the prey of the species, the interests of which are disconnected from her own ends; this antimony reaches its climax in the woman; it expresses itself among other ways by the opposition between two organs: the clitoris and the vagina. In the infantile stage, it is the first which is the center of feminine eroticism: some psychiatrists claim that there exists a vaginal sensibility in some little girls, but this is a very controversial opinion; it cannot be known and in any case, would have only secondary importance. The clitoral system does not change in maturity<sup>2</sup>; and the woman maintains this erotic autonomy all her life; the clitoral spasm is, like the male orgasm, a kind of detumescence which is reached in a quasi-mechanical way; but it is only indirectly linked with normal coitus, it plays no part in procreation. It is by the vagina that the woman is entered and impregnated; it only becomes an erotic zone by the intervention of the male and this always constitutes a kind of violation. It was by real or simulated rape that woman was in the past torn from her childish universe and flung into her domestic existence; it is a violence which changes her from a girl into a woman: it is also spoken of a "robbing" a girl of her virginity, or of "snatching" her flower.

This defloration is not the harmonious ending of a continuous evolution, but an abrupt break with the past, the commencement of a new phase. The pleasure is then reached through contractions of the internal surface of the vagina. do these result in a precise and definite orgasm? This is a point which is still argued. The facts of anatomy are very vague. "The anatomy and the clinics prove abundantly that the greatest part of the interior of the vagina is not innervated," the Kinsey report says among other things. "Many surgical operations can be performed upon the interior of the vagina without recourse to anaesthetics. It has been demonstrated that in the interior of the vagina the nerves are localized in a zone which is in the internal wall close to the base of the clitoris." However, besides the stimulation of this innervated zone "the female may have consciousness of the intrusion of

1. Vol. 1, Chap. 1 of the author's *The Second Sex*.

2. Unless circumcision of the clitoris is practised, as is the rule among certain primitive tribes.

an object into the vagina, particularly if the vaginal muscles are contracted; but the satisfaction thus obtained probably corresponds more to a muscular tonicity than to an erotic stimulation of the nerves." Nevertheless there is no doubt that vaginal pleasure exists; and even vaginal masturbation—among adult females—more widespread it would seem than Kinsey says.<sup>3</sup> But certainly the vaginal reaction is a very complex one, which can be defined as psycho-physiological because it concerns not only the whole nervous system, but relies upon the whole situation lived through by the subject: it demands the deep consent of the whole individual: the new erotic cycle which is inaugurated by the first coitus requires, in order to be established, a kind of "montage" of the nervous system, the working out of a form which is, as yet, only outlined and which must also envelope the clitoral system; it takes a long time to realize itself and sometimes never succeeds.

It is striking that the woman should have a choice between two cycles, one giving her a perpetual juvenile independence while the other devotes her to the man and to the child. The normal sex act, in effect, places the woman in a state of dependence upon the male and upon the species. It is he—as with almost all the animals—who has the aggressive role while she submits to his embraces. Normally she can always be taken by the male; while he himself is able to take her when he is in a state of erection; on the other hand, except in a very special case of revolt so profound that vaginality seals the woman more surely than the hymen, the feminine refusal can be conquered; again vaginality leaves to the male the means of satiating himself upon a body that his muscular power allows him to reduce to his mercy. Since she is an object, her inertia does not basically modify her natural role; so that many men do not care to know whether the woman who shares their bed desires coitus or only submits to it. One can even sleep with a corpse. Coitus could not occur without male consent and male satisfaction is its natural end. Pregnancy can occur without any feeling of pleasure on the woman's part. On the other hand, pregnancy is far from representing for her the sexual process: quite the contrary, the service demanded from her by the species begins at this moment: it is slowly and painfully realized in the pregnancy, delivery and nursing process.

Consequently the "anatomical fate" of man and woman are profoundly different. Their moral and social situations are not less so. Patriarchal civilization has dedicated the woman to chastity; the right of the male to satisfy his sexual needs is recognized more or less openly while the woman is limited to the marital relationship: for her the sexual act if it is not sanctified by the code or by sacrament, is a sin, a downfall, a defeat, a weakness; she is obliged to defend her virtue, her honor; if she "yields," if she "falls" she stirs up scorn; while there enters a note of admiration in the very reproach that is inflicted upon her seducer. From primitive civilizations to our time it has always been admitted that the woman sleeps with the man as a "service" in return for gifts

or in assurance of her upkeep; but to do service is to have a master; there is no reciprocity in this relation. It is proved both in the structure of marriage and in the life of prostitutes: the woman gives herself and the man takes her and rewards her. Nothing forbids the male as master from taking women of inferior status: love affairs with maidservants have always been tolerated, while the bourgeois woman who surrenders to a chauffeur, or a gardener—degrades herself socially.

The Americans from the South, so fiercely racist, have always been permitted by custom to sleep with Negro women, before the Civil War as well as today, and use this right with a lordly arrogance: a white woman who would have commerce with a Negro during the time of slavery would be put to death and she would be lynched today.<sup>4</sup> When a man wants to say that he has slept with a woman, he says that he has "possessed" her or that he has "had" her; and inversely in order to say that one has "had" someone, one sometimes vulgarly says that one has "screwed" her; the Greeks called "Parthenos ademos" the unruly virgin, the woman who had not known the male; the Romans called Messalina the "invicta" because none of her lovers had given her any pleasure. For the lover, then, the act of love is conquest and victory. If in another man the erection often seems like a mocking parody of the voluntary act, each, however, considers it in his own case with some vanity.

The erotic vocabulary of the male is inspired by the military vocabulary. The lover has the mettle of a soldier, his sex drawn taut like a bow, when he ejaculates he "discharges" it, it is a machine-gun, a cannon, he speaks of attack, of assault, of victory. There is in his sexual assault something of a taste for heroism. "The reproductive act being the occupation of a human being by another one," wrote Benda,<sup>5</sup> "impresses on one the idea of a conqueror on the one hand, and on the other hand the idea of a conquered thing. Again, when they treat of their love affairs the most civilized people speak of conquest, attack, assault, siege and of defense, defeat, capitulation thus clearly tracing the idea of love to that of war. This act allowing the pollution of a human being by another one imposes on the pollutor a certain pride and on the polluted one, although willing, some humiliation." The latter phrase introduces a new myth: namely that the man inflicts defilement upon the woman. As a matter of fact, the sperm is not an excrement; one speaks of "nocturnal pollution" because the sperm is at that time diverted from its natural end; but because coffee might soil a light dress, one would not state that it is dung and soils the stomach.

Other men claim, on the contrary, that the woman is impure because it is she who is "soiled with humors" and because she soils the male. The fact of being the one who pollutes confers, in any case, a very ambiguous superiority. As a matter of fact, the privileged situation of man comes from the integration of his biologically aggressive role with his social function as a chief, a master; it is through this latter than the physiological differences take their full meaning. Because man is ruler in this world of ours he claims as a sign of his sovereignty the violence of his desires; one says of a man endowed

3. "The use of the artificial penis is found without interruption from our day to the days of classical antiquity and even previously. Here is a list of objects discovered these last years in vaginas and bladders and that could be extracted only in consequence of surgical intervention: pencils, pieces of sealing wax, hairpins, spools, pins of bone, curling irons, sewing needles and knitting needles, needle cases, a draughtsman's compass, glass stoppers, candles, cork stoppers, goblets, forks, tooth picks, tooth brushes, ointment jars (in a case cited by Schroeder the jar held a may bug and consequently was a substitute for Japanese riunotama) hens' eggs, etc.... The larger objects were found, as was to be expected, in the vaginas of married women." H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, Vol. I.

4. The translator feels this to be an error in fact. A white woman who slept with a Negro in the most fiercely racist parts of the South might be humiliated or disgraced but she would not be lynched. The Negro, if caught, would be lynched. What the translator feels to be an exaggeration of the truth, in no way, however, weakens the argument of this point.

5. The Uriel Report.

with great sexual capacities that he is strong, that he is powerful, epithets which designate him as an activity, as a transcendence. On the contrary, the woman being but an object, one says of her that she is warm or frigid, which is to say that she will only be able to manifest passive qualities.

The climate in which feminine sexuality is awakened is, then, entirely different from the one the adolescent encounters. On the other hand, at the moment that the woman confronts the man for the first time, her erotic attitude is very complex. It is not true, as it has been occasionally claimed, that the virgin does not know desire and that it is the man who awakens her sensuality; this legend once again betrays the man's taste for domination, his wish that nothing be autonomous in his mate, not even the desire she feels for him. As a matter of fact, it is often contact with the woman which stirs up desire in the man and, conversely, most girls feverishly summoned caresses before any hand had ever stroked them.

My hips used to give me the appearance of being a boy and with my whole being I used to feel a boundless impression of expectation, an appeal which rose in me having a meaning that was only too clear: I could not sleep at night; I twisted and turned; I was restless, feverish and sorrowful . . . said Isadora Duncan in *My Life*.

A young woman who made a long confession of her life to Stekel told him:

I began to flirt passionately. I needed a "titillation of the nerves." A passionate dancer, I used to close my eyes while dancing in order to abandon myself completely to this pleasure. . . . While dancing, I expressed a kind of exhibition because the sensuality overcame my modesty. During the first year I danced passionately. I loved to sleep and I slept much and masturbated every day, often for an hour. . . . I masturbated often until I was drenched with sweat and, incapable of continuing because of my fatigue, I fell asleep. . . . I burned and I would have welcomed anyone who would be willing to abate my fever. I did not look for an individual but for Man.<sup>6</sup>

What we find here, rather, is that the virginal disturbance is not expressed as a precise need: the virgin does not know exactly what she wants. The aggressive eroticism of infancy survives in her; her first impulses will be a reaching for the summer of her sexuality and she will still have the desire to embrace, to possess. She wishes the prey which she covets endowed with qualities which have revealed themselves to her as values through her taste, her capacity for smell, and her sense of touch. Because sexuality is not an isolated sphere, she prolongs the dreams and the joys of sensuality. Children and adolescents of both sexes love smoothness, creaminess, satiny-like qualities, softness, elasticity, that which yields to pressure without collapsing or decomposing, or which slips under the sight or under the fingers.

Like man, the woman is charmed by the warm softness of hills of sand which are so often compared to breasts, by the rustle of silk, by the downy tenderness of an eiderdown quilt, by the soft-as-velvet quality of a flower or a fruit; and it is singular that the young girl should cherish the pale, pastel colors, the airy quality of tulle and of muslin. She does not have a taste for rough materials, for gravel, rockwork, for strong tastes, for sour odors; this is because of the smooth maternal flesh that she has first caressed and cherished as did her brothers. In her narcissism, in her homosexual experiences, diffuse or precise, she played the part of a subject and she sought possession of a feminine body. When she confronts the male, she has in the palm of her hands, on her lips the longing

to actively caress her booty. But the man with his hard muscles, his grating and often hairy skin, his harsh scent, his lineaments coarsely shaped, does not appear desirable to her, and even inspires repulsion. This was expressed by Renée Vivien when she wrote:

I am a woman, I have no right to beauty  
I was forbidden your hair, the pupils of your eyes  
Because your hair is long and full of odors.

If the prehensile, possessive tendency remains the strongest in the woman, she will turn toward homosexuality like Renée Vivien. Or she will attach herself only to men whom she can treat as women: thus the heroine of *Monsieur Venus* by Rachilde buys a young lover whom she likes to caress passionately but by whom she does not allow herself to be deflowered. There are women who like to caress boys thirteen or fourteen years old or even children and who refuse to give themselves to a grown-up man. It has been seen, however, how, with most women, a passive sexuality has also developed from childhood: she likes to be embraced, caressed; and particularly since puberty wishes to make herself a body in the arms of a man; it is to him normally to which the role of subject belongs; she knows it, "a man does not need to be beautiful" she has been often told; it is not for her to seek in him the inert qualities of an object but for might and for virile strength.

Thus she discovers that she is divided within herself: she summons a robust embrace which changes her into a quivering thing; but the harshness and the strength are, at the same time, ungrateful resistances which hurt her. Her sensuality is localized simultaneously in her skin and in her hand: and the demands of one are in part opposed to those of the other. As far as she can, she chooses a compromise: she surrenders to a virile man but young enough and charming enough to be a desirable object; in a handsome adolescent she will be able to meet with all the traits which she covets; in the *Hymn of Hymns* there is a symmetry between the delight of the spouse and that of the husband; she grasps in him what he looks for in her: the earthly flora and fauna, precious stones, running brooks, and the stars. But she does not have the means of taking hold of these treasures; her anatomy condemns her to remain awkward and powerless like a eunuch: the desire for possession is aborted by want of an organ in which to incorporate itself. And the man refuses a passive role. Often, moreover, circumstances drive the girl to make herself the prey of a man whose caresses move her, but whom she does not like, either to look at, or to caress in return. It has not been said often enough that in the repugnance which mingles in her desires, there is not only a fear of masculine aggressiveness, but also a profound feeling of frustration. Voluptuousness will have to be conquered against the spontaneous impulse of sensuality while in man the joy of touching is fused with what is properly called sexual pleasure.

The elements of passive eroticism are themselves an odd mixture. There is nothing so equivocal as a contact. Many men who handle any kind of material whatever without disgust, hate to have grasses or animals brush against them; the feminine body when it is brushed by silk or velvet sometimes quivers agreeably and sometimes bristles: I remember a friend of my youth who would get goose-pimples at the sight of a peach; one slides easily from disturbance to titillation, from irritation

6. The Frigid Woman.

7. Renée Vivien was a famous poet in the early 1900's in France.

to pleasure, arms entwining a body can be a refuge and a protection, but they also imprison, they stifle. In the virgin, this ambiguity perpetuates itself owing to the paradox of her state: the organ through which her metamorphosis will be completed is sealed. The uncertain and burning summons of her blood is spread throughout the entire body except in the very spot where the sex act has to occur. No organ permits the virgin to satisfy her active eroticism; and she does not have the living experience of the one who dedicates her to passivity.

This passivity, however, is not pure inertia. In order that the woman be moved, positive phenomena have to occur in her organism: innervation of the erogenous zones, swelling of certain erectile tissues, secretions, a rise in the temperature, quickening of the pulse and the respiration. Desire and voluptuousness require of her, as of the male, a vital expenditure of energy; the feminine need, although receptive, is in a sense active, making itself known by an increase in the nervous and muscular tonicity. Apathetic and languid women are always frigid. The question arises as to whether there is a constitutional frigidity and to be sure psychic factors play a prevailing role as far as the erotic capacities of women are concerned; but it is certain that physiological deficiencies, a poor vitality, express themselves among other ways by sexual indifference. Conversely, if the vital energy expends itself in deliberate activities, in sports, for example, it is not integrated in the sexual need: Scandinavians are healthy, robust and frigid. Women with "sex appeal" are those who reconcile languor and passion like the Italians or Spaniards, which is to say those whose intense vitality flows in the blood.

To make oneself an object, to make oneself a passive object is something completely different from *being* a passive object: an amorous woman is not a sleeping or a dead one; she possesses an élan which unceasingly recedes and is renewed: it is

the receded élan which creates the spell in which the desire is renewed. But the balance between ardor and abandon is easily destroyed. The male desire is tension; he may invade a body of tense nerves and stiff muscles: postures and gestures which demand willing participation from the organism do not annoy him and on the contrary often serve the male desire. Any voluntary effort, on the other hand, prevents the feminine body from being receptive; this is the reason why the woman spontaneously refuses those forms of coitus which require fatigue and tension of her; very abrupt variations, too many different positions, the exaction of consciously directed activities, gestures or words break the spell. The violence of the unleashed propensities can bring about quivering, contraction and tension; women scratch or bite, their bodies stiffen, endowed with an unusual strength; but these phenomena only occur when a given climax is reached, and it is reached only if the absence of all rules—physical as well as moral—allow, from the very beginning, a sexual concentration of the whole vital energy. That is to say, it is not enough for the girl to *let herself go*; docile, languid, abstracted in mind, she does not satisfy her partner, nor he her. What is asked of her is an active participation in an adventure that neither her virgin body, nor her conscience encumbered by taboos, prohibitions, prejudices or requirements, do positively will.

Simone de BEAUVOIR

Translated by Avel Austin

Simone de Beauvoir is a leader of the Existentialist movement in France. She is on the editorial board of *Temps Modernes* and the author of the novel, *Blood of Others*. Special permission was given to ANVIL to reprint the above section of her article.

## Trends In The Modern Dance

### *Emergence Of The Modern Dance As A Distinct Art Form*

**PERHAPS THE MOST IMPORTANT** development in art in the 20th Century has been the conscious emphasis on form as form, that is, a pre-occupation with formal values. If form is defined as the development of thematic material, then a pre-occupation with form implies experimentation and innovation in the ways and means of developing one's material. The problem of form inherent in any attempt at composition is one which every artist in any society has had to face; for form is the cohesive agent, the vigorous discipline necessary to any means of expression. In painting, literature, sculpture, dance, and music, this pre-occupation with form, in all its aspects of space and color, rhythm and harmony, and shape and texture, has been a part of the general rejection of traditional forms. The atonal system of Schoenberg, and the whole abstractionist and non-objectivist movement, have provided the artist with new forms as well as new materials. In dance, this experimental activity has resulted in the "Modern Dance" as an art form distinct from ballet.

The state of the ballet in the first two decades of the 20th Century was one in which artistic creation was for the most part negated. Dancers of the caliber of Nijinsky and Pavlova, and choreographers like Fokine, were exceptional in that they

could sincerely develop their art despite the preciousness and the narrow traditionalism of ballet. Ballet compositions consisted of leaps and turns and steps, taken directly from a technique class and existing in new concatenations. Everything was thrown in, to make the ballet itself nothing more than a vehicle for brilliant ballerinas and graceful and effeminate men. Such as it was, the ballet was a spectacle, and the physical excitement of the leaps and turns was negated by the vulgarity of their organization and projection.

The great problem which the artist must continually ponder is that of his approach to the use and function of the materials of his art. It is only through a considerable probing, and awareness of his medium that the artist develops his personal expression to the point where it speaks of universal truths. The reason for the decline of ballet, during the early 20th Century, seems to me to be due to a superficial conception of how a dancer should move. The balletic conception of the use of the body was essentially this: that the upper body should remain in a strong upright position, while the legs move swiftly and precisely, and the arms gracefully take complementary positions. The body was seen as an instrument, light and graceful in its carriage, which could seemingly defy

gravity in its performance of many difficult feats—much the same as an admirer would view a weight-lifting exhibition. Instead of trying to understand movement as people move, naturally and expressively, instead of loving the strength and the movement of the body, as we know it, at work and at play, instead of observing the way people walked and ran, the way they gestured, the way they expressed joy and sadness, the way they would trip and fall, the way they reclined, and the way they stood, waiting, instead of believing in the inherent expression of the human body, and in the validity of all sorts of physical relationships—instead of all this, ballet had become a series of gymnastic, physical “tricks,” with no real understanding of the medium and the materials of dance.

It was at this time that the “Modern Dance” emerged as a new approach to the use and function of the body, and as an art form more directly concerned with the three dimensional character of the stage. In its inchoate state the pioneers of “Modern Dance,” Mary Wigman, Martha Graham, Doris Humphrey, and some others, discarding foot-wear completely, wearing only the most necessary apparel, and dancing on a bare stage, reinforced by strange, cacophonous music, or no music at all, began to experiment with movement and its significance in space. They approached dance from the point of view of natural movement, and emphasized the plasticity and expressiveness of the body. They felt, as Elizabeth Selden says, that the kinetic material of the dance should follow necessarily from the nature of the composition; that the dancer should create his technique afresh, so to speak, with every dance, according to its inner necessity. They believed that the dancer should strive constantly to bring his technique up to the new levels which his inspiration reached, and that he should grow as his inner horizon widened. The training of his body was conceived, not in a number of invariable fixed “steps,” but in action modes, that is, ways of moving, and they considered these to be limitless possibilities which he would explore. In other words, while the ballet dancer learned certain steps in class, and repeated them on stage in different combinations, the modern dancer learned how to use his body so that he could explore the possibilities of developing movement in space.

Of great importance was the establishment of the whole pelvic area as the source of strength in the body; important because it led to what I would call visceral movement. This kind of movement issuing from deep inside the body and possessing a primordial quality was instrumental in the development of a wide range of textural movements. The use of the middle and upper body could now be extended, in off-center suspensions, in expressive distortions, in off-balance falls and in various other ways because of the strength and counter-balance of the pelvic area. For instance, the use of heavy movement which had been regarded as ugly by ballet has become an essential part of the modern dancer's vocabulary. One of the most poignant dances of our generation, Doris Humphrey's *Day On Earth*, is concerned with work, the regeneration of man's spirit, saddened and turbulent, in physical labor. The movements indicating the strain of the plow and the heat of the sun are filled with a weary tension, expressive and beautiful. Another dance by Miss Humphrey, *Water Study*, was an attempt to capture the different pulsations and qualities of the sea, from the playful, bubbling texture of a calm, to the harsh, rhythmic pounding of the surf.

This experimentation with different textures and qualities in movement has resulted in a new awareness of space. for if

the human body is the instrument of the dancer, it is his relationship to space that defines the dance. The expanse that Martha Graham creates in *Appalachian Spring* is a miracle of spatial design (aided by the magnificent architectural setting of Isamu Noguchi). There is the sensation of looking up at the horizon and of observing the growth of something great and beautiful and, as the critic Edwin Denby has said, there is the feeling of green forests and green woodlands and the touch of fresh, cool air that pervades this great dance. It is captured in the impressiveness of the slow movements and in a full, open duet which sings volumes of gaiety and space; and it can be found in the use of an outward focus by the dancers as they look around at the impressive expanse of the frontier. Perhaps the greatest exponent of the use of space in dance is the German modern dancer, Mary Wigman. In an article on dance, Hanya Holm says about her former teacher:

Wigman grapples with space as an opponent and caresses it as though it were a living sentient thing. In her gestures and movements she carves boldly and deliberately visible and fluid forms, shaping, surrounding, and sinking in the space which presses close about her.

This use of space as a cardinal element in American “Modern Dance” has resulted partially as an incidental product of the tensions created by the off-center movements, the various falls, and the distortions of the body. This plastic conception of the body tended to use space more dynamically and to define it with more precision than did the two dimensional patterns of ballet. The symmetry and the straight vertical and horizontal that characterized ballet has been replaced in the “Modern Dance” by asymmetrical patterns and an extensive use of the diagonal and the broken or jagged line, together with circular and ellipsoidal patterns. It is because of the nature of the movement and of the design of the dance that space becomes such an important positive element in “Modern Dance.”

The past thirty years has also seen the regeneration of the ballet. Both *Pillar of Fire* and *Undertow* of Antony Tudor and some of the American ballets of Jerome Robbins and Agnes de Mille have used an increased vocabulary and have made imaginative use of the traditional ballet vocabulary. And, particularly in the ballets of George Balanchine, one notices a new awareness of form and of spatial design. This state of affairs in both “Modern Dance” and ballet seems to presage an era of renewed creative activity and of continued exploration of the materials and the medium of dance. To those of us who are not dancers the “Modern Dance” can provide in our understanding of its approach to the use and function of the body a greater awareness of our physical dignity and expression.

Harvey LICHTENSTEIN

Harvey Lichtenstein is a student at Brooklyn College.

## **The NEW INTERNATIONAL**

**A Bi-Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism**

Review of Books by Wolfe and Deutscher

Max Shachtman

The World Confederation of Free Trade

Unions ..... Pedro Bonet

and other articles, reviews, editorials

25¢ per copy

• \$1.50 for six issues

**THE NEW INTERNATIONAL**

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

# The Film Review Forum

## GERMANY YEAR ZERO

**THE BEST THING IN** Roberto Rossellini's new film, *Germany Year Zero*, is the opening sequence of bombed-out Berlin. Yet this factual panorama, the only part of the movie that is free of internal contradictions, is cheated of most of its impact by an external and wholly gratuitous phenomenon: the voice of Quentin Reynolds, speaking for America, and rising from the ruins to inform us that what we are looking at is no more than Justice Triumphant. It is no more than what the German People—men, women and children (even infants, presumably, born after 1945)—deserve for the crimes of Nazism.

Mr. Reynolds talks in this vein for something like five minutes, long enough for the camera to complete its elliptical but uncompromising tour of the city. Yet the spirit of his monologue, after it is finished, lies heavily-handedly all over the story that follows, controlling the action, the characters, the dialogue, the plot. The film can't be considered apart from it. In his review of *Paisan*, in the Fall issue of *ANVIL*, Parker Tyler justly accused that movie of being propaganda for America—more specifically, for America's European representative, the Marshall Plan. *Germany Year Zero* is a continuation of the job, its Vansittartist bias being a negative plug for capitalist democracy. See what is happening to all these people who preferred Hitler to someone like Roosevelt or Churchill! The artistic hazards of such an enterprise are bound to be numerous, but what is really interesting about this movie is the way in which, considered purely as propaganda, it defeats itself. The development of its major argument contains an inconsistency so glaring that its failure to attract official notice can be attributed only to the lulling effects of that argument itself.

### A "Typical" German Family

To prove Mr. Reynolds' contention—i. e., the Germans are beasts who got what was coming to them—Rossellini chooses for his protagonists a German family which I assume he is offering as typical (he nowhere gives the impression that he intends them to be unique): a father, a daughter and two sons living on the edge of destitution in two rooms of a squalid Berlin apartment, one of the few, apparently, that were missed by American and British bombs. The father is dying of heart disease; the older son is an ex-Nazi soldier hiding out in the family home from the American Army of Occupation, which he erroneously believes will imprison and torture him, or even worse, put him to death, if it finds him. The daughter, young and pretty, is like her brother unemployed, not because like him she is afraid to look for work but because there isn't any. She supplements the meagre family resources with what she is able to get in the way of cigarettes and other extras by dancing with French soldiers. She is unique in not turning to actual prostitution, as so many of her friends have done. The young-

er son, barely an adolescent, devotes all his waking hours to the almost hopeless task of keeping his family from starvation. Officially too young to work, he works harder and longer than any adult at this adult business—running errands, playing the black market, doing whatever he can for whomever will employ him. His overwhelming sense of responsibility toward his family drives him in the end to commit what is legally a crime. He kills his father to end the old man's hopeless suffering, and to relieve his sister and brother of the problem of keeping him alive.

### Paragons of Virtue

With the exception only of the older son, who refuses through the greater part of the film to risk the death he believes is in store for him by giving himself up and thereby sparing his family the expense of feeding him (and his is after all an understandable human weakness, for which he makes restitution in the end), every member of this "typical" German family is morally perfect. The father, though he occasionally berates the older son for not giving himself up, does so not for his own sake but for the sake of his daughter and his other son. In every other respect he is a model of dignity and forbearance; even Quentin Reynolds couldn't object to him. Indeed, almost as soon as Reynolds stops talking, he takes over the pulpit, assuring us, in the faltering accents of defeat, that ghastly though his life is, it is no more than, being a German, he deserves. The daughter is virtuous on the two, often conflicting, levels of conventional and private morality. Concerned though she is over her family's welfare, she cannot bring herself to secure it by becoming a prostitute—even in a dead-end society where scruples, serving no social purpose, are worthless, and prostitution is a woman's only career. As for the younger son, he, in his virtue, is incredible. Without being accused of cynicism, one may doubt the existence of a boy so young whose only thought is to provide for his family, and whose personality hasn't a trace of that love of mischief, idleness and pleasure which is common to boys everywhere, and which in a world as demoralized as the one he lives in might be expected to flourish rather than die out. (Another boy in the film, a minor character who steals and sleeps with a little girl not yet in her teens, is far more plausible.)

Thus Rossellini, in order to prove that the Germans are monsters of evil who deserve all the horrors they are living through, presents us with a "typical" German family who for startling heroism and sheer everyday virtue (against insurmountable odds) are unmatched by any family anywhere—outside of that cloud-cuckoo cornbelt which includes Hollywood movies, radio soap operas, and fiction of the slicks and pulps.

One can't accuse Rossellini of having fun with Quentin Reynolds, and all the other Americans who think as he does, of render-

ing extravagant lip-service to a thesis which he is determined, at the same time, to expose as ridiculous. If this were so, he would be a superb artist rather than a flawed, often mediocre and only fitfully brilliant one. But the film as a whole contains no further touches of that special irony which has been a feature of Italian genius from Macchiavelli through Count Mosca down to Pirandello. There are, I think, more sober reasons for the inconsistency between the film's thesis and its development. There is no limit to what a person may do in creating works of imagination, bad as well as good. He may tamper with reality, distort it, defame it, make it serve any questionable end, but when reality, like the reality of Year-Zero Berlin, is particularly aggressive, it has a way of ganging up on the felon who would sell it short, and making him pay for his crime. A false, sentimental view of life (the Reynolds thesis boils down to no more than this) invariably produces false, sentimental characters and false, sentimental situations, and where the surrounding reality is resistant, the pressure of falsehood will be all the heavier. In other words, if you set out to prove that the German People, en masse, are no good, you can do so only by presenting us with a group of "typical" Germans who are too good to be true. Who are the members of Rossellini's "typical" German family but clichés that have been handed down through generations of low-brow literature? Who hasn't encountered them before, on the stage, on the radio, in fiction, in Hollywood's long career, spoken and unspoken, of gibberish? The dying father, preaching wisdom and sanctity from his deathbed, the erring son, proving before it's too late that he too can be noble, the daughter who will make any sacrifice for her family but *that*, the little boy (in the 1890's, he sold matches on the streets of New York and London) whose sole desire is to keep his family from starving, and who knows a joy more profound than that of an ordinary boy over the possession of a baseball bat, when his efforts in this direction meet with some small success? The only stereotype missing from the Rossellini collection is the son of an American millionaire, who could have turned up in the nick of time to marry the girl, save the family from perdition, and eventually transport them all to America, where, surrounded by the Four Freedoms, they could settle down to a life of ease and wealth and moral superiority, their guilt wiped out in no time by liberal applications of apple pie.

### Comparison with *The Search*

It is to Rossellini's credit as a director—and as a man, moreover, who has experienced at closer hand than any Hollywood director some of the horrors his movie is concerned with—that nothing like this happens, and that the film as a whole avoids certain other vulgarities which its basic faults might have been expected to attract. (It does, however, have a "happy ending," given an ironical twist which I can only suppose is unintentional. Because of the father's murder and the younger brother's suicide, the surviving brother and sister can be sure of a better life.) If we compare *Germany Year Zero* with such a picture,

son, the background of misery surrounding the Kohler family, the collective misery of Berlin, is convincing even though the Kohlers themselves are not. And certain minor characters—an ex-schoolmaster who is still a Nazi, a group of depraved children—have every kind of relevance to the material; they grow as it were out of the smashed buildings, the drifting crowds, the broken streets, the atmosphere of stagnation which some good camera work suggests to us is everywhere. It is when it deals with the individual tragedies of the Kohler family that the film fails; and for this there is another reason besides the unreality of these characters. It lies in Rossellini's attitude toward them, an attitude which is less that of a creator than an executioner. They are not true tragic characters, innocent unfortunates at the mercy of a fate whose laws they can't begin to fathom; they have been wicked, and are being punished for it—and of this, through every moment of their dreadful lives, they are articulately aware. So that we sympathize with them only to the degree that we sympathize with the confessed criminal on his way to the electric chair or the gallows—these people who at the same time that they are monsters of evil, symbols of "German guilt," are impossible models of virtue for citizens everywhere.

Helen NEVILLE

Helen Neville is a guest contributor to ANVIL. Her reviews have appeared in *Partisan Review*.

## SCREEN IMAGERY AND THE SOUTHERN WRITER

**FICTION, ACCORDING** to the historians of literature, has evolved from a narrative sung by a poet into the mass-produced novel. The evolution continues today although we do not know its end. It continues, in one sense, with the absorption of widely acclaimed novels into motion pictures which appear to strive for authenticity and faithfulness to the conception of the novelist. This claim is made for two current movies, one from a novel by Faulkner (*Intruder in the Dust*, MGM), the other from a novel by Robert Penn Warren (*All the King's Men*, Columbia). In the terms used by those journalists who specialize in movie reviews, these are excellent pictures and hardly anyone who likes the movies would find them slow or uninteresting or unintelligent.

Nevertheless, there are obvious and serious weaknesses in both of these motion pictures.

The motion picture remains to some extent an unexplored medium. It is capable of a richness of imagery of which we are today only slightly aware. There are common examples of this imagery: a newspaper headline refers to some tragic event we have just witnessed on the screen; we see the newspaper carelessly tossed into the gutter by some bystander; the wind tears it; it is trampled; the rain sweeps it half

submerged in a muddy torrent until it reaches a sewer hole and disappears from sight.

This is merely a trite beginning in the use of screen metaphor, and yet how effectively the camera is able to capture the ruthless quality of modern civilization, submerging tragedy and making it history, callously and brutally, before it is cold, in the feelings of the people whom it affects. The instances and problems of the motion picture as an art are too numerous and complex for the space of a brief review. Let us examine, merely, the two adaptations of novels into movies mentioned above, in order to see what the motion picture studio has neglected.

### Advantage of Novel Over Film

The novel has the advantage of being a much older and more highly developed form than the motion picture. It has acquired a tradition in which the narrative serves at least two purposes. It is not merely dramatic continuity, action, but also a series of events which alters the *consciousness* of its main character: his sense of duration or of history, his sense of tradition, his sense of values, his sense of what it means to be alive or to be dead. The main character, in turn, is *not necessarily* the most active person in the story, nor the most aggressive one, the one who dominates all the other characters. But he is the one most conscious of the *meaning* of events, of their political, or philosophical, or cultural, or racial, or personal meaning; of their tragic quality or comic quality, of their real or unreal quality. Among the most highly developed and most complex examples of such personalities in modern fiction are Stephen Dedalus and Hans Castorp. In a less intellectual tradition, but nevertheless in this tradition fall the novels of the American Southern writers, William Faulkner and Robert Penn Warren.

These novelists have developed characters with a strong consciousness of the fact that both real and unreal elements merge in the racial and the cultural attitudes of the Southerner. They both describe the mixed aspects of this consciousness through a well-controlled prose form, the internal monologue. In this internal process, as often occurs in poetry, a sensitive person becomes painfully aware of time past impinging upon and distorting the present, of old cultural institutions perverting modern cultural drives. The general chaotic condition of the world takes the specific form of the old pastoral South disturbed by the inroads of industry and commerce and by the inroads of bourgeois values, substituting concrete and steel for soft clay and green grass, substituting the aristocracy of money for the aristocracy of family, substituting fast living for graceful living, substituting the squalor of the slum for the poverty of the slave. The whole tradition of Negro-white relations becomes insecure, chaotic and violent. Modern politics merges with the corrupt county machines of the old South. History, falsified and distorted by overzealousness or bigotry becomes something unreal on the one hand, or bitterly real and true on the other. Throughout it all, social conventions are discovered to be

inadequate as mores.

In order to express all this, fiction has experimented with the internal monologue, having, it might be argued, the advantage of the *word*, which has a clear and decisive meaning. Not so—at least not clearly so! All effort in the recent past has been an attempt to enrich the word by using it as a symbol. Used in this way the word no longer has a clear and literal meaning, but has two or more meanings. This is characteristic not only of the word as symbol, but of the image, the ideograph, the *picture*. In groping for a metaphor with which to characterize James Joyce's prose style in *Ulysses*, Harry Levin, significantly enough, seized upon the word "montage." "The movement of Joyce's style, the thought of his characters, is like unreeling film; his method of construction, the arrangement of this raw material, involves the crucial operation of *montage*."

The most highly intellectualized fiction, then, has moved in the direction of *visual imagery* and of poetry in which meaning comes not literally but through a process of association and *feeling* and in which *not every meaning* is clearly understood by everybody and in precisely the same way. In this art, the camera which combines movement, color and the ability to make an object seem strange or different by changes in focus, light, shadow and distance has the ability to experiment with mood and feeling in a seemingly unlimited way.

### Hollywood Handling of Novels

This intellectual content in the novels of Warren and Faulkner is discarded in the movies in favor of another element. Both novelists dramatize the process in which consciousness is altered by involving their main characters in situations of extreme violence, perhaps because preceding the moment of engagement in brutal action, man is stripped bare of the usual conventions, and of all self-control except that which follows from an internal code or discipline. It is the moment of nakedness when every hate and fear stands out beneath the surface like a well articulated muscle beneath the bare skin. Not only is this violence a part of Southern tradition, but it also serves to counterpose a sense of unreality (in the sense that any nightmarish event seems at the moment unreal) to the strong grip upon reality which the main character must retain in order to survive the experience. Violence is, for both of these authors, not a thing valued for itself, but as a means of posing the problem of appearance and reality. At the very moment of unreality, in the heat of violence, the real personality shows itself.

The presence of this quality in strong quantities is perhaps the reason why Faulkner and Warren are often misread: their fiction is read as melodrama. In the face of Hollywood, of course, another factor is involved. The motion picture art, like a very young boy, is almost all action. It's understanding of the melodrama is highly developed. It excels when its characters are so simply motivated that they can be clearly evolved by means of the act. It lacks, on the other hand, a tradition or a technique for dramatizing the more complex internal

evolution which is seldom clearly expressed in an immediate act. A director who extracts the melodrama from a novel is assured of some basis for a successful picture. One who attempts a more complex form would find his work, to some extent, experimental. The novelist is concerned with catching the moment just prior to or just after the action, arresting it and seizing the elements of conflict within the human spirit, watching the decision emerge painfully and spasmodically from the convulsions of morality in the grip of convention, love in the grip of death and nuance in the grip of tradition. Even the stage today lacks the ability to depict this as the Elizabethan theater could have done. The then declamatory tradition made it possible for Hamlet to be a classic example of the internal monologue completely externalized. We expect Hamlet to declaim, at the moment of respite when he has sheathed his sword, the nine lines including the well known:

"The time is out of joint; O cursed spite,  
That ever I was born to set it right."

A James Cagney, on the other hand, may put his fist in his pocket long enough to say: "What a stinkin' world; why do I have to be the sucker to change it?" But to conceive of him making what for Hamlet would be a short nine-line speech is impossible.

Robert Rossen, who adapted and directed *All the King's Men*, knows some of the possibilities of screen imagery when used to depict the internal thought process. He applied it very timidly and in vulgar form in one brief scene in *Undercover Man*. His limitations are those of most Hollywood writers and directors.

#### Changes in Film Version

What has been done with *All the King's Men* and *Intruder in the Dust* is the writing of the screenplay as melodrama in which the story is reproduced, but the complexity of the conscious participant is omitted. This is more true of Robert Penn Warren's novel. Jack Burden is transformed into a less significant character and with his loss of stature his role as commentator, student of history, amateur philosopher, and wordy cynic is diminished. As melodrama, *All the King's Men* is exciting, consistent unto itself, interesting, and capably performed in the Hollywood pattern: the boss, his moll, his stooge, his son. Willie Stark's capacity for evil is leavened by a strain of naivete or honesty, by his tenderness as a father or lover, or husband. Its political approach manages gently to imply the right things about incipient fascism and its connection with industry and finance capital, its popular appeal and broad support among middle class elements.

*Intruder in the Dust* begins in a more interesting way. A more serious attempt is made to realize the action in terms of the boy, of his past experience with race, and with this particular Negro who refuses to behave as a Negro is expected to behave in Southern terms. The consciousness of the boy occupies many of the opening scenes. When the movie becomes more and more concerned with trapping and discovering the slayer, however, some of the interest is lost. Perhaps this is because there is less

justification in Faulkner's novel for emphasizing the melodrama at the expense of the lonely debate in the mind of the boy.

What remains, then, is exciting, intelligent entertainment. If one can imagine Shakespeare's play so transformed that Hamlet becomes a secondary character while most of the revised story tells of the murder of Hamlet's father, the wooing of Hamlet's mother by his uncle, the discovery of evidence that the King is a murderer, violent duels between those who defend the King and those who would revenge his vic-

tim, then you have a parallel with the kind of emphasis which Hollywood has placed upon contemporary Southern themes. In a certain sense, Hamlet represents the most extreme form of tragic, and historic consciousness. And all young men who discover the process of evil and corruption as fictional characters contain in themselves elements of his intense ego.

Avel AUSTIN

Avel Austin is a graduate student at Columbia University.

## From the Student's Bookshelf

### LOVING<sup>1</sup>

by Henry Green

#### WERE HENRY GREEN'S NOVEL.

*Loving*, less the exceptional success it is, the attention of criticism would still be warranted. With so much of the modern novel devoted—for better or worse—to an extension of this loosest of literary forms, an attempt at intensification of a more traditional aspect of the novel is noteworthy. Green's attempt to realistically capture the present offers somewhat of a paradox, being at the same time both experimental and traditional. And it is almost ironic that the writing of a good realistic novel should be a radical achievement, too.

*Loving* is a realistic novel in the formal sense because Green's chief concern and success is with what has always been the goal—subject matter aside—of this type: to gain verisimilitude by recreating experience in the present so that the experience has the present's immediacy. The degree of Green's success, his capturing the present in a structure that is almost air-tight, gives the critical reader additional insight into the machinery of the novel, and in my case, a perspective that made my formulation possible.

The characters in the novel have virtually no pre-history apart from their actions and speech in the book. Green, from the first page, has them speaking just as if their thoughts had been preceded by a hundred pages of story. No lengthy rationales are given, and it is for this reason that the opening line of the book, "Once upon a day an old butler called Eldon lay dying in his room, attended by the head housemaid, Miss Agatha Burch," is disarming. It is disarming because the transition from the phrase, "once upon a day," to the action of the story is immediate and because this first phrase is practically the only expository device in the book. The book ends surprisingly but logically (and with an ironical effect that only knowledge of the whole story can communicate) with another, the mate of the first: "Over in England they were married and lived happily ever after."

The slight action of the novel is about life in the servants' hall and quarters of an Englishwoman's castle in Ireland. It

takes place during the war when the threat of German invasion faced England. The castle is, for the most part, closed and unused, and is maintained by its aristocratic owner from a sense of duty and propriety . . . but not always without regrets, for the "help-situation" is acute. Having the story occur in this place and under war-time conditions serves a number of purposes, both structural and thematic. Away from the mainstream of "reality," it is possible to establish a world more or less complete in itself—at least in terms of significant action. And the new status of the domestics although temporary because it is based upon the war-time shortage of help, seems to be a theoretical basis for servants being the central characters in a story—not necessarily *this* story but *a* story. The overall war situation—which affects the action only indirectly—seems to make possible for the first time the treatment of this class of people as individuals, individuals capable of the range of the human personality.

#### Place and Plot

Thus, the servants' quarters are in the foreground and that part of the castle inhabited by the owners is in the background. But just as a relationship between the two exists, albeit a new relationship, in the life of the novel as well as the form, there is also a counterpart on the higher social level of the servants' love situations. Moreover, this counterpart reinforces the main theme of the novel. The love affair between the castle owner's daughter-in-law and an officer in the local Irish Republican Army has all the pain for the lovers, especially the young woman, that consciousness of its being illicit can bring, whereas on the servant level cause for this particular complication does not exist. Another, more poignant, does. It is the homosexual love of Kate for Edith.

Its unconsciousness marks this complication as different in the dramatic sense, too. And as it is unconscious, so is it unrealized in a single love act. The love merely remains a manifestation of their daily experience and contact in other aspects of their lives, their working together and being room-mates. Edith, in turn, comes to love Raunce, who succeeds the dead Mr. Elton as head butler. Raunce is no more than a caricature of manhood. He is no longer young, has dyspepsia, and even his eyes are different-

<sup>1</sup> Viking Press, New York. 1949.

colored. He is not, of course, worthy of Edith and he cannot waltz as Kate can and does—with Edith in the deserted ballroom of the castle to the music of a phonograph. Yet Raunce wins her and eventually marries her, whereas Kate doesn't even "lose" Edith because their love never reached the point of becoming a question in their lives.

The above is not the whole plot of the novel, nor are the implications of the relationships noted, fully drawn. There is a delicate and subtle poignancy that is never maudlin or sentimental. In a review all these qualities can only be stated. The overall difficulty in discussing a novel like *Loving* lies not in any complex plot—it is not even a long book—but in that there is an almost total interdependence between its parts, and that to do the book any justice, adequate discussion of all these parts is necessary. This is true even down to the title of the book, which, with its participial ending, contains not only the theme of the novel, but also indicates the author's method of execution.

Ralph MARCUS

## THE STARS BEAR WITNESS<sup>1</sup>

by Bernard Goldstein

WORLD WAR TWO had woven itself into a tragic meshwork of such enormity that by the time it was over nearly every culture had suffered its impact. Perhaps this very universality of misery has had a certain deadening effect, rendering one people insensitive to the sufferings of another. Perhaps too, we think of the war as a jungle of anguish, and in so doing, fail to see some of the mottled and twisted vines which have their setting in this jungle. Whatever the reason, the most tragic single phenomenon in our era, if not in all of history, has astonishingly fallen into oblivion. Bernard Goldstein's *The Stars Bear Witness* is the first book to appear on the literary horizon, dealing exclusively with the nightmarish story of the ill fated Jews of Warsaw.

Mr. Goldstein, a leader of a socialist group known as Der Allgemeiner Yiddisher Arbeiter Bund (Jewish Workers Bund), has gathered his material at very close range; the entire book amounts to a chronicle of what the author experienced shortly before, during, and after the days of the Warsaw Ghetto. Mr. Goldstein paints his characters amid a background of a doomed people; a people who had just begun to find their place in the configuration that was pre-war Poland and who were now herded behind a Ghetto wall, destined to die. In hundreds of little connected sketches he describes the people he lived and worked with, the people around whom he built his hopes for a decent way of life, a socialist way of life. He tells of their struggles, their dreams, their fantasies, their courage, their frailty, and almost invariably, their abrupt and gruesome deaths. In these brief pages a half million murdered Jews live again. We can see them in their day by day struggle against starvation and disease, in their pitiful attempts to cling to Jewish culture despite insurmountable obstacles.

<sup>1</sup> Viking Press, New York. 1949.

These pages are filled with grotesquely struggling figures in a losing battle for life, bartering, bribing, smuggling, stealing, sacrificing anything in order to live another day or another week.

### Brutal Deception

It was this very will to live that the Germans used most effectively against the inhabitants of the ghetto. When the Germans began the extermination, victims were obtained on the pretext that they were being transferred to work camps. The first deportations were even put on a volunteer basis. Thousands of Jews marched with their baggage to the cattle cars. They went to the gas chambers smilingly munching bread and jam, thinking that they were launching upon a new and better life.

Shortly after the establishment of the ghetto a Jewish police force was formed. Here again, the many Jews who joined in the desperate hope of thereby being saved were soon among the best tools of the Germans. During the latter part of the deportations each policeman was ordered to bring in six victims daily. Failure to do so meant that he himself would be deported.

The fact that, despite the indescribable torture suffered in the ghetto, some moral feeling survived stands as a startling monument to the human spirit. While the work done by the many groups involved in the ghetto social scheme is touched upon, Mr. Goldstein concentrates upon the notably heroic role played by the organization of which he was a leader, the Socialist Bund. The Bund maintained illegal schools and kindergartens, set up soup kitchens, sheltered countless hunted Jews, printed and forged documents and published a series of underground newspapers which warned against the deportations and urged an armed resistance.

While Bundists maintained the struggle within the ghetto those few who had escaped Poland worked tirelessly to get help to the ghetto. Among these socialists was Arthur Ziegelboim who, when met with the consistent refusal of the Allied world to send aid to the ghetto after the resistance had begun, committed suicide in London. His farewell letter was a shocking reminder to the world of a grave moral responsibility it had failed to fulfill. His suicide was his last and most tragic testament to his people.

### Heroic Struggle Against Nazis

When the ghetto uprising finally began only fifty thousand Jews were left alive. Somehow they kept fighting the German military machine for forty-four days. At first they fought with the few weapons they had smuggled into the ghetto; later they fought with clubs and fists. That the fighting continued for so long is a miracle which can be understood in terms of the hate and the desperation that filled the few that still remained alive in the ghetto. By the time the fighting was over nothing of the ghetto was left but a mass of rubble heavy with the odor of burnt and rotting bodies.

A few Jews escaped alive after the fighting. Many of these survivors died later fighting in the Polish underground just before Warsaw was captured by the Russians.

After Warsaw had fallen to the Russians, Mr. Goldstein decided to leave Poland. Nothing he had lived and worked for in the past remained . . . everything was destroyed.

Bernard CORNFELD

Bernard Cornfeld is president of the Socialist Club of Brooklyn College and a member of the editorial staff of ANVIL.

ARE YOU TIRED of the SECURITY & BENEFITS  
PROVIDED BY THE U. S. ARMY?

Then LIVE DANGEROUSLY! Join the

## WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE

The War Resisters League is made up of men and women who refuse to participate in any war. They hold that non-violent resistance offers more hope for men than the organized violence which strengthens alike Soviet authoritarianism and American militarism.

The membership declaration of the WRL is:

*"War is a crime against humanity. I therefore am determined not to support any kind of war, international or civil, and to strive for the removal of all causes of war."*

Send signed blanks to the  
WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE  
5 Beekman Street  
Room 1025  
New York 7, N. Y.

- ☐ Please send me more information.  
☐ I wish to join the WRL.

Name .....

Address .....

# **PROGRAM of the NEW YORK STUDENT FEDERATION AGAINST WAR**

The primary aim of the New York Student Federation Against War is to organize all students opposed to the war drives of Russian and American imperialism which threaten the very existence of world civilization.

We aim to prevent the polarization of the American student into the reactionary war camps of either Russian or American imperialism.

We do not believe that the threatening war is inevitable. We believe that a militant anti-war student movement can be an effective force to prevent a Third World War.

## **I. AGAINST WAR PREPARATIONS**

We oppose all social, economic, and political preparations for war on the part of Russian and American imperialism.

*Therefore, we oppose:*

1. The 15 billion dollar war budget.
2. Conscription, Universal Military Training and the ROTC.
3. The use of atomic energy for war purposes.
4. The growing militarism of the American government.
5. The North Atlantic Pact and the American subsidization of the military machines of Western Europe.
6. The bolstering of reactionary regimes in Greece and Turkey.

*Therefore, we favor:*

1. Repeal of the draft.
2. Withdrawal of all occupation troops throughout the world.
3. Colonial freedom and the right of self-determination for all oppressed people.
4. Letting the people decide; a national referendum on war.
5. Granting amnesty and restoration of full civil rights to all those imprisoned or who lost their civil rights because of their opposition to World War II.

## **II. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND CIVIL LIBERTIES**

The assault on academic freedom and civil liberties is a part of American imperialism's preparation for war through methods which resemble the totalitarian techniques of the Russian police state.

*Therefore, we oppose:*

1. The attempt to straight-jacket the American campus through legislation like the Feinberg Bill.
2. All forms of racial and religious discrimination among students and faculty as attempted through the quota system and segregated schools.
3. Faculty and administration supervision of student organizations.
4. The suppression of political minorities through the use of such legislation like the Smith Act.

*Therefore, we favor:*

1. Effective student government of student affairs.
2. Complete freedom of political expression for students and faculty members.
3. The right of students to organize on campus for their political opinions.
4. The abolition of all government subversive lists, loyalty oaths, and such bodies as the House Un-American Activities Committee.
5. Passage of a Civil Rights program and the repeal of the Smith Act.

## **III. EDUCATION**

1. For a free state university.
2. For a universal free college education.
3. For the right of students and faculty to organize and strike.

## **IV. LABOR**

1. The NYSFAW seeks to establish close ties with the labor movement and to actively cooperate with all sections of the labor movement in the fight against the drive to war.
2. We oppose all efforts to destroy the independence of the labor movement, and therefore are in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and all similar legislation.

### **Interest and Membership**

If you are interested in joining or receiving more information about the *New York Student Federation Against War*, fill out the blank below accordingly and mail to the Federation at 247 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

**I WANT TO JOIN    I WANT MORE INFORMATION**

Name .....

Address .....

School .....

### **Subscription**

Enclosed find 60 cents for a one-year subscription to ANVIL.

Name .....

Address .....

School .....

Mail to: New York Student Federation Against War  
247 Lexington Ave.      New York, N. Y.